392 541 9
A392541 9N
CHANGED

THE
UNIVERSITY OF WINNIPEG
PORTAGE & BALMORAL
WINNIPEG, MAN. R3B 2E9
CANADA
DISCARDED

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/morethingsthatma0000geor

MORE THINGS THAT MATTER

Uniform with this Volume

SOME THINGS
THAT MATTER

BY

LORD RIDDELL

"Particularly interesting are the chapters on the art of public speaking in which Lord Riddell himself is an all-round adept. . . . Here, then, is a book which will help every reader, young or old, to avoid logical pitfalls and to take a keener and more intelligent interest in the world without and the world within."—*Morning Post.*

"Lord Riddell's book is obviously intended for the man in the street who is faced by the ordinary problems and questions that face every one of us. It should certainly hit its mark."—*Daily Mail.*

"A sparkling commonsense is the distinguishing note of Lord Riddell's volume. . . . It is a book full of wisdom and without a single dull paragraph. . . . This collection of essays is a volume of brilliant commonsense, easy of comprehension, even by folk who have not the thinking habit."—*Evening Standard.*

"The essays are full of good meat. . . . I find the book to be rich in common sense and vastly entertaining."—*Clement Shorter in the Sphere.*

"Lord Riddell has many striking things to say in 'Some Things that Matter.' Ranging over a wide variety of subjects, he shows an equal familiarity with, and mastery of, them all."—*Punch.*

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
LTD., PUBLISHERS, LONDON

MORE THINGS THAT MATTER

PR
6035
.I4
M6

BY

LORD RIDDELL

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
LIMITED LONDON
MCMXXV

Made and Printed in Great Britain. Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome and London

PREFACE

These articles, which appeared originally in *John o' London's Weekly* during 1922-3-4, are being republished in response to requests from readers who desire them in more permanent form.

R.

May, 1925

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Digging up the Greeks	9
Arthur James Balfour	19
The Curse of Temperament	27
Winston Churchill	35
Mind and Body	39
Educational Mysteries	43
"A Bird's-eye View of India"	53
From Belsize Park to a Golden Howdah	63
The Real Karl Marx	70
What America Wants	79
Mysteries of the Law	88
Looking the Part	96
The Scottish Idol	102
Lord Haldane	106
Drink: Poison or Panacea?	113
The New Slavery	120
Ford of the "Ford"	129
Ideals, Citizenship, and Education	139
Protecting Posterity	142
"Goodwill to Men"	149
The Good Old Days	155
The Real Smuts	161
Biographical Verbosity	166

PAGE

"Education Fisher" 176
The Socialist Plan for a New World . . . 184
The Truth about Venizelos 196
Dividing the Spoils 203
How the Chinese Dragon lost her Tail . . . 210
Where is China Going? 219
Balance-Sheet English 224
Groping for the Mind 231
A Builder of Wisdom 237
Cupid asks some Curious Questions 243
Untying Land Knots 253
Ring-fencing the World 259
Is Britain a Back Number? 265
Problems of the Future 287
Lord Curzon's "Tales of Travel" 297
How to Sell Goods 303
When to Stop 311
Democratic Perplexities 313

DIGGING UP THE GREEKS

Supposing that by some strange process of reincarnation you could spend half an hour with an ancient Greek, what would you ask him? If I had the opportunity, I think I should say: "Mr. Greek, can you tell me in a few words what enabled your small country to achieve such great things? How came it that the Greeks founded mathematics, physics, philosophy, and literature? What was the essential quality of the Greek mind?" Probably he would reply: "Forgive me, I am tired of the subject. Let us discuss something more modern and interesting. If you want to learn about the Greek point of view, read Mr. R. W. Livingstone's new book, 'The Pageant of Greece,' published by the Oxford University Press; or if that does not suffice, his 'Greek Genius and its Meaning to Us.' You can get them for 7*s.* 6*d.* each. Meanwhile, will you please describe the effect of Jazz music upon the mentality of the Anglo-Saxon race? That subject is more interesting to me than a discussion about what occurred 2,000 years ago."

This might be a snub, but it would be good advice. Those who, like myself, do not know Greek, are under a special obligation to Mr. Livingstone for his

delightful books. I shall try to summarize his account of the Greek mentality, as stated in "The Pageant of Greece," adding a few remarks of my own.

The three sources of the spiritual and intellectual life of Europe are Greece, Rome, and Judea. From Rome we derive our notions of government, law, and organization. From Judea the golden rule and our ideas of the unseen world. From Greece the scientific spirit—the desire to see things as they are, the pursuit of truth for its own sake, and the art of lucid logical statement in as few words as possible. With the Greeks the search for truth and the accurate and unprejudiced statement of facts was part and parcel of their mentality. No one questioned the right to challenge existing theories. The object was to see the world as it is.

For centuries the scientific spirit was obscured by the break-up of the Roman Empire, inheritor of the Greek tradition, and by the benumbing influence of the Church. Galileo, Bacon, Harvey, and others revived it, but even to-day we lack the detachment of the Greeks. Some subjects, such as the investigation of natural phenomena, or the causes of disease, are dealt with in the Greek or scientific manner, while others, such as temperance, are debated with the asperity which characterizes a cat and dog fight. Neither side can be relied upon to state the facts that tell against them. Each starts with a preconceived idea and tries to establish a case. It must be admitted, however, that Greek mentality undiluted is

not a factor for success in men of action. The doubter rarely succeeds.

The Greeks and Jews bequeathed another point of view which still consciously or subconsciously permeates the lives of most of us—the fear of fate:

> The Giant shades of fate silently flitting
> Pile the dim outlines of the coming doom.

If we say we are doing well, as a sign of humility, we touch wood to propitiate the gods. If we are doing badly, we are apt to hold gloomy ideas of the future. For some unknown reason, Americans are not obsessed by these traditions. If an American is doing well, he is certain that he will be doing even better to-morrow. If he is doing badly, he is convinced that conditions will improve. In short, a spirit of optimism pervades the whole community and is, perhaps, America's chief asset. Everything is always for the best in the best of all possible worlds —to wit, America.

The Greeks not only thought clearly, they usually expressed themselves clearly. They understood the art of compression and self-denial in amplification. In this, as in other matters, they acted on their favourite maxims, " The half is often better than the whole "—and " not too much." In another word—moderation. The Greek style was not marred by the bane of the modern biographer who, to earn his fee, must produce a book of a certain size, or the leader writer who must write so many words. They said what they had to say as concisely as possible, and frequently left something to the reader's imagination.

Mr. Livingstone gives striking examples of the Greek method of statement. The epitaph, "His father Philip laid here to rest his twelve-year-old son Nicoteles his high hope." Sappho's description of sunset —"Star of evening that brings all things which bright dawn scattered, you bring the sheep, you bring the goat, you bring the child back to its mother." Mr. Livingstone compares this with Byron's version:

> O Hesperus, thou bringest all good things—
> Home to the weary, to the hungry cheer,
> To the young bird the parent's brooding wings,
> The welcome stall to the o'erlaboured steer;
> Whate'er of peace about our hearthstone clings,
> Whate'er our household gods protect of dear,
> Are gathered round us by thy look of rest,
> Thou bring'st the child too to its mother's breast.

As Mr. Livingstone says, some may prefer Sappho and some Byron. He might have added that the beauty of Sappho's lines are probably marred by translation. The two specimens quoted are, however, exceptional examples of Greek restraint. They often wrote with more freedom. For instance, the famous little poem by Callimachus in memory of his friend Heraclitus:

> They told me, Heraclitus, they told me you were dead;
> They brought me bitter news to hear and bitter tears to shed.
> I wept as I remembered how often you and I
> Had tired the sun with talking and sent him down the sky.
> And now that thou art lying, my dear old Carian guest,
> A handful of grey ashes, long, long ago at rest,
> Still are thy pleasant voices, thy nightingales awake,
> For Death, he taketh all away, but them he cannot take.

Each form of expression has its merits, but the

power to express emotion in a simple telling phrase is not uncommon even amongst the uneducated. I remember seeing an epitaph written by a labourer's wife which in its way was just as telling as that quoted by Mr. Livingstone:

> To the memory of John Macintosh,
> Husband of May Macintosh.
> He was her all in all.

The Greek historians, Herodotus, Thucydides, Plutarch, etc., were the chief exponents of the characteristic merits of Greek prose—simplicity and directness. Mr. Livingstone prints an admirable series of extracts from these and other writers, which not only give an idea of their style, but help to acquaint the reader with the Greek point of view.

When we turn to Greek contributions to science and philosophy, we can realize why Lord Macaulay described the Greeks as the most remarkable people who had yet existed. To appreciate Greek achievement, imagine a world without scientific knowledge, such as existed 700 B.C. Then consider what the Greeks discovered during 500 years, in mathematics, astronomy, engineering, mechanics, anatomy, zoology, physics, medicine, oratory, and philosophy. Pythagoras (500 B.C.), the first person to suggest that the world and planets were round, and the founder of mathematics; Archimedes (born 287 B.C.), whose mathematical achievements are held by experts to surpass those of any other man, and inventor of the science of hydrostatics; Aristotle (born 385 B.C.), originator of scientific research and literary and

dramatic criticism; Hippocrates (born 460 B.C.), the father of medicine; Euclid (about 323 B.C.), the terror of youth, are only a few of the wonderful Greeks who changed the face of human knowledge. But, as Mr. Livingstone points out, the Greeks were wise as well as learned.

Aristotle in one of his books—I forget which—descants on the difference. He says a man may know much and yet not be wise. The acquisition of a number of facts does not constitute wisdom. A man who has specialized in one subject is not necessarily a sound adviser on the general affairs of life. Wisdom comes from intuition and experience. Intuition depends upon an instinctive grasp of first principles. The young are rarely wise, because they lack experience and allow their emotions to guide them. Older persons with emotional characters are seldom persons of good judgment. The highest form of wisdom is a combination of intuition and scientific knowledge. To be scientific a man must know the principles upon which his belief rests, the object of science being to establish universal truths.

To put Aristotle's argument in simpler fashion: Wisdom consists in the appreciation due to heredity, and experience of the principles which govern all reasoning, and it may be added the prejudices, uncertainties, perversities and illogicalities of life. The wise man has a sense of detachment which enables him to see things as they are and not as he wishes them to be.

Needless to say, Greek intellectuals were much con-

cerned with the art and conduct of life. They were fond of discussing such questions as : What is happiness ? What should be the aim of the individual wayfarer in this perplexing world ? What is virtue ? Is virtue profitable ? What is the mind ? What is the soul ? Is it immortal ? How should the State be organized ? Under what conditions should commerce and industry be carried on ? How should the selfishness of mankind be controlled—or eradicated ? Is it possible to avoid the unequal distribution of wealth ? Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and others discussed in minute detail most of the problems confronting us to-day. Indeed, it is a curious reflection that Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb's plan for a new world is little more than a modern repetition of Plato's scheme, and that Aristotle should have forestalled the modern critics of Communism and Socialism.

Plato planned a State to be governed by superintellectuals and the citizens of which were to work " each for all and all for each." Mr. and Mrs. Webb have the same idea, but, being disillusioned I suppose by the experiences of the intervening 2,000 years and despairing of securing supermen as proposed by Plato, substitute committees similar to those which manage the affairs of the London County Council.

Like Plato, they are evidently oppressed by the individualistic tendencies of mankind and the incompatibility of equality and discipline. Whether the mass of the people were interested in the weighty and elusive problems that occupied the minds of

the Platos and Aristotles seems doubtful. Probably conditions were similar to those which obtain now. Human nature does not seem to have changed. To-day I doubt whether more than five per cent. of the adult population ever read a serious book unless it happens to relate to their trade or profession. Where one person is interested in history, literature, philosophy, or economics, a thousand are occupied with racing, football, dancing, etc.

No doubt it was the same amongst the Greeks. This is confirmed by a fascinating poem by Theocritus (born 305 B.C.) describing the visit of two Syracusan women staying at Alexandria to the festival of Adonis. The ladies' names are Gorgo and Praxinoe. They might well be Mrs. Brown and Mrs. Smith. Gorgo calls for her friend, who lives in the suburbs. Eunoe is one of Praxinoe's servants. Some part of the following extracts is taken from Mr. Livingstone's admirable translation (on the whole better reading than any I had seen before) and the remainder from that by Mr. Edmonds in the Loeb Library :

GORGO : Is Praxinoe at home ?

PRAXINOE (*running forward*) : Dear Gorgo, at last. Yes, I am at home. I thought you'd forgotten me. (*To the maid.*) Eunoe, find a chair—get a cushion for it.

GORGO : It will do beautifully as it is. O what a silly I was to come ! I could hardly get here through the crowd and the carriages. Nothing but heavy boots and men in uniform. And what a journey ! My dear, you really live *too* far off.

PRAXINOE : It's all that insane husband of mine. He has come here to the end of the world and taken a hole of a place not fit for a human being to live in, out of sheer jealousy, so as to

prevent you and me being neighbours. He is always the same. Anything for a quarrel. He is a stupid creature. . . . The other day, when I sent him to a shop to buy soap and rouge, he brought home salt instead.

GORGO: Mine is just like him. A perfect spendthrift. But never mind, get on your things and let us be off to the palace to see the Adonis. I hear the Queen's decorations are splendid. . . .

PRAXINOE (*after some hesitation*): Eunoe, pick up your work; and take care, lazy girl, how you leave it lying about, the cats find it just the bed they like. Come, bestir yourself, fetch me some water quick! I wanted the water first, and she brings me the soap. Never mind; give it me. Not all that; don't be so extravagant. Pour out the water. (*Eunoe washes her mistress's hands and face.*) Oh, you stupid! What do you mean by wetting my bodice like that? I have got washed somehow, thank goodness! (*To Eunoe.*) Now, where is the key of the large wardrobe? (*She takes out and puts on a smart gown.*)

GORGO: Praxinoe, you can't think how well that dress made full suits you. What did the material cost?

PRAXINOE: Don't mention it! More than eight golden sovereigns, and I put my very soul into making it up.

GORGO: Well, all I can say is it's *most* successful.

PRAXINOE: It's very kind of you to say so. Bring me my shawl, Eunoe, and put on my hat properly. No; I'm not going to take you, baby; there's a bogey on horseback who bites little boys. You may cry as much as you like, I'm not going to have you lamed for life. Come along. Nurse, take baby and amuse him. Call the dog in and shut the street door. (*In the street.*) Good heavens, what a crowd. How we're going to get through this awful crush I can't imagine. They are like ants. What will become of us? Here are the Royal Horse. My good man, don't ride over me. . . . From the time I was a girl two things have frightened me more than anything else: a shiny snake and a horse.

GORGO: Look what a squeeze at the palace gates!

(*They get inside after a struggle.*)

GORGO: Come here, Praxinoe. Before doing anything else, look at these embroideries. How exquisite! They might wear them in Heaven.

PRAXINOE: The weavers who made the material and the embroiderers who did that close detailed work are marvels. The

figures seem to stand up and move as if they were living things and not needlework. It *is* wonderful what people can do.

And so on. There does not seem to be much difference between 300 B.C. and 1925.

Before parting with "The Pageant of Greece" I must thank Mr. Livingstone for some happy hours. Not only have I enjoyed his remarkable book, but under its stimulating influence I have re-read with increased pleasure many of the works to which he refers.

The controversy regarding a classical education which is still raging has implications frequently overlooked. After reading Mr. Livingstone one feels more than ever that inadvisable as it may be to teach the ordinary boy Greek and Latin, all young people of both sexes should know and understand what the Greek and Roman civilizations were and how they affect us.

Even those well versed in Greek literature often possess no definite idea of the Greek point of view. They know the language, they know the story, but they do not understand what the Greeks contributed to human progress. "The Pageant of Greece" puts the matter in a nutshell. Mr. Livingstone has written a remarkable book which can be strongly recommended.

ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR

Forty-six years ago Mr. Arthur James Balfour, then aged thirty-one, stepped into the intellectual arena to do battle with the ghost of John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, Huxley, Tyndall, Leslie Stephen, Principal Caird, and other pundits of the first water. His weapon was a book bearing the enigmatical title "A Defence of Philosophic Doubt." It made quite a sensation. In those days philosophical and religious controversy was popular. Darwinism was comparatively new. ("Origin of Species," 1859; "Descent of Man," 1871.) The scientists were busily engaged in attacking revealed religion. Public men like Mr. Gladstone eagerly joined in the fray. John Stuart Mill had only been dead six years. Spencer was grinding out enormous tomes regarded with deep reverence by a small but select band of disciples. The knowable and unknowable, the authenticity of miracles, and evolution were favourite topics in all circles with the smallest claims to intellectuality.

To this conflict came Mr. A. J. Balfour—on his father's side a member of a well-known Scottish family; on his mother's, descended from the Elizabethan Cecils. Brains were a strong point with the Balfour family. One of Mr. Balfour's brothers was

a comparative embryologist of rare distinction, with a brilliant future cut short by early death. Another was a notable architect; and a third, Mr. Gerald Balfour, possesses great scientific attainments.

Lord Balfour is seventy-seven. He first held office at the age of thirty, when he became Private Secretary to his uncle, the late Lord Salisbury. One day in 1916, pointing to a window in the Foreign Office, he remarked: "That was the room where I commenced my official life. I was prouder of it than of any other room I ever occupied." Since then he has held with great distinction almost every high position in the State. He has a quality which impresses every one who comes in contact with him. At Washington an American said to me: "Your Balfour is the great gentleman of the Conference." That sums him up.

Although nearly fifty years old, apart from intrinsic merits, "A Defence of Philosophic Doubt" is an interesting volume, in view of the author's subsequent career. It is not light reading, and cannot be recommended as a bed book, albeit readers uninitiated in the mysteries of philosophy and metaphysics might find it soporific. The question has been asked, "What would have happened had Mr. Balfour restricted himself to philosophy, if Mr. Asquith had become Lord Chancellor instead of Prime Minister, and Mr. Lloyd George had gone to Spurgeon's Tabernacle instead of the House of Commons?" Who can tell? No doubt each would have been a success.

In the early part of 1923 Mr. Balfour (then, of course, Earl Balfour) entertained a party of distin-

guished men at Whittingehame. After dinner they walked in the gardens in all the glory of a starlit night. To their delight and surprise, their host gave them a charming but learned astronomical disquisition. On being pressed, he admitted he had written many unpublished monographs on the subject. Therefore it may be that what politics gained was lost to science. "A Defence of Philosophic Doubt" is spoken of by many, but read by few. It has had a curious effect on Mr. Balfour's career. During the whole of his political life he has been regarded as a doubter, whereas, in fact, he is a person of most decided opinions—no one more so, and no one more resolute in maintaining his views against all comers. Beneath his gentle, courtly exterior is a character composed of the finest-tempered steel. The erroneous impression that he is a doubter is confirmed by his conversation and habit of gliding over difficult situations by inconclusive statements. But experience seems to show that in foreign affairs, at any rate, there is a good deal to be said for ambiguity. Mankind does not yet seem able to face clear-cut issues without quarrelling. "A Defence of Philosophic Doubt" is really no justification for Mr. Balfour's reputation as a doubter. It displays the author's true character in many ways.

(1) His courage and confidence in his own judgment. His apparent diffidence is misleading. Alfred Lyttelton remarked that Arthur Balfour could always cope with any intellectual situation that presented itself. And so he can.

(2) His disregard for expert opinion. His desire to investigate and criticize any proposition, however authoritative. Experts have no terrors for him.

(3) His industry. At the age of thirty he had read and mastered masses of literature dealing with logic, philosophy, and psychology—Kant, Mill, Spencer, Berkeley, Hume, Spinoza, Descartes, and so forth. Contrary to public belief, Lord Balfour has been an indefatigable worker all his life.

(4) His intellectual acuteness.

"A Defence of Philosophic Doubt" is a highly technical work on logic, philosophy, and religion. Its purpose was to defend Christianity against the vigorous bombardment to which it was being subjected by scientific men. The attack had assumed a new phase due to the Darwinian theory and general progress of science. The allegation was that science disproved revealed religion. Mr. Balfour carried the war into the enemies' camp by contending that science itself was illogical and that many scientific beliefs, like many theological beliefs, did not depend upon proof, but upon intuition. It was, he said, a case of the pot calling the kettle black. Theologians might be unable to prove their case, but could scientists prove theirs when it came to the point? What right had they to assume such a high and mighty position, without first demonstrating the logical basis of science? His main point was a criticism of the scientific rule, called "The Law of Causation," that every effect has a cause and that a similar cause invariably produces a similar effect. Mankind in

general recognize it, although they do not always act on it. Indeed, it is one of the chief guides of life, although the complexity of human affairs frequently makes its application difficult or impossible. Furthermore, we must remember that scientific principles are only conditionally true. They are ever liable to revision by fresh and more accurate information.

Nevertheless, " we believe that plants produce seed after their kind and we do not expect to gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles," to quote Mr. Joseph's well-known work on Logic (Clarendon Press). Mr. Balfour's criticism of the rule was that scientists can never be certain of the cause of an event. To-day they may think that A is caused by B, while five years hence they may discover that the cause was C. In short, science is ever shifting. He did not deny that the rule was a good working hypothesis, but denied its validity as an absolute logical guide. " If," said he, " the so-called laws of Nature are only provisional and liable to revision when more accurate knowledge is forthcoming, what becomes of the rule ? " The scientists answer that the *true* cause of an effect whatever that cause may be is when repeated invariably followed by a similar effect. Here we may leave this rather abstruse argument. Those who are interested should read the nineteenth chapter of Mr. Joseph's " Logic," in which they will find a luminous disquisition on the subject. In discussing what he described as " the scientific claim to infallibility " Mr. Balfour raised the question whether logically the results of scientific investigations are

more entitled to belief than the direct evidence gained by our five senses, which scientists allege (and, it may be observed, ordinary mortals agree) is often misleading. "Logically," said Mr. Balfour, "why should one class of evidence be preferred to the other? How can you tell which is right?" Of course, he did not contend that scientific evidence was not reliable and should not be acted upon. His point was that logically there was no ground for preferring it to that of the senses.

This argument is not convincing, although logically it may be sound. The sailor armed with a telescope sees more than is visible to the naked eye. Logically, unless it be possible to verify his observations, there is no reason for preferring his evidence to that of the most short-sighted man. Nevertheless, we all rely on the man with the telescope. And so it is with the result of scientific investigations. Mr. Balfour's book had a strong bearing upon the authenticity of Biblical miracles, a much-discussed subject at the time when it appeared. Huxley and others, following in the footsteps of the famous Hume, challenged miracles on the ground of improbability, as being contrary to the laws of Nature. Mr. Balfour's comment was that there was no logical reason for disputing the intervention of a supernatural power, however improbable such an event might be. Because Nature has invariably observed a certain order, there is no reason logically why that order should not be disturbed by some unknown and overriding cause. It is impossible to refute this argument from a logical point of view.

The question is one of probability. As stated already, our actions, and, apart from religion, our beliefs, are based on the Uniformity of Nature.

Whether Mr. Balfour's subtle arguments have strengthened or weakened the religious beliefs of many people is doubtful. Those who have faith believe, and are not likely to be perturbed by inconsistencies between science and religion. On the other hand, those who have not faith are unlikely to be converted by arguments showing that both science and theology stand logically on insecure foundations and that ultimately in both cases mankind is forced back upon intuitive beliefs. " The Defence " touches upon metaphysical problems which have mystified philosophers since Parmenides first propounded them 2,500 years ago. Does the universe consist of one or many things ? Does anything exist but one indivisible, timeless, changeless whole ? Are there two worlds—an apparent world which, we think, we see and feel, and a real world consisting of a universal mind ? Is our knowledge of the universe intuitive, or is it derived exclusively from the senses ? How can we prove that there is an external world ? How do we know anything of the external world except through the medium of our senses, which afford different sensations at different times and under different conditions ? Do we know anything but our own minds, and is there anything else to know ? Are there many minds or only one mind of which our minds are undivided homogeneous parts ? What do we know ? How do we know ? What can we

know? These questions, which have occupied the greatest minds in all ages, may at first sight appear absurd and far-fetched. On examination, however, they will be found to go to the heart of things. But the problems are no nearer solution than they were 2,500 years ago, and there is little satisfaction to be gained in wrestling with them. It is better to adopt the first of the so-called fundamental laws of thought —the law of identity—" Whatever is, is." In other words, that what is real is intelligible. Life is short. There are many things to be studied, and one may as well devote one's attention to a subject offering more practical advantage.

THE CURSE OF TEMPERAMENT

THE mysteries of life and death have fascinated philosophers and poets for thousands of years. They have been expressed and commented upon in many different ways, but are ever the same mysteries. "Why am I here?" and "Whither am I going?" are the eternal questions. "A Book of Australasian Verse," by Walter Murdoch (Oxford University Press), has again directed my attention to Adam Lindsay Gordon, sometimes called the Australian Byron, who dealt with these problems in his own arresting fashion.[1] Gordon came of a noble Scottish family, was born in 1833 and educated in England. At the age of nineteen, owing to various escapades, he was sent by his father, Captain Gordon, to Australia, where he became successively mounted policeman, stockrider, horse-breaker, livery-stable keeper, steeplechaser, and a member of the South Australian Parliament.

His poems are typical of his life. They breathe open air, sport, and energy, but are pervaded by melancholy, morbid recklessness, fatalism, and metaphysics. "The Sick Stockrider" is one of the best:

[1] "Poems of Adam Lindsay Gordon" (3*s.* 6*d.*); "Gordon and his Friends" (12*s.* 6*d.*). Constable.

Hold hard, Ned! Lift me down once more, and lay me in the shade.
Old man, you've had your work cut out to guide
Both horses, and to hold me in the saddle when I swayed,
All through the hot, slow, sleepy, silent ride.

. . . . . .

'Twas merry 'mid the blackwoods, when we spied the station roofs,
To wheel the wild scrub cattle at the yard,
With a running fire of stockwhips and a fiery run of hoofs;
Oh! the hardest day was never then too hard!

I've had my share of pastime, and I've done my share of toil,
And life is short—the longest life a span;
I care not now to tarry for the corn or for the oil,
Or for the wine that maketh glad the heart of man.

For good undone and gifts misspent and resolutions vain
'Tis somewhat late to trouble. This I know—
I should live the same life over, if I had to live again,
And the chances are I go where most men go.

The deep blue skies wax dusky, and the tall green trees grow dim,
The sward beneath me seems to heave and fall;
And sickly, smoky shadows through the sleepy sunlight swim,
And on the very sun's face weave their pall.

Let me slumber in the hollow where the wattle blossoms wave,
With never stone or rail to fence my bed;
Should the sturdy station children pull the bush flowers on my grave,
I may chance to hear them romping overhead.

Gordon was one of those unhappy beings cursed with a dual temperament. On the one hand, dreamer, metaphysician, and moralist. On the other, the reckless, daring spirit.

And as one who pursues a shadow,
As one who hunts in a dream,
As a child who crosses the meadow,
Enticed by the rainbow's gleam,

I—knowing the course was foolish,
And guessing the goal was pain,
Stupid, and stubborn, and mulish—
Followed and follow again.

The restless throbbings and burnings
That hope unsatisfied brings,
The weary longings and yearnings
For the mystical better things,
Are the sands on which is reflected
The pitiless moving lake,
Where the wanderer falls dejected,
By a thirst he never can slake.

. . . . .

Some flashes, like faint sparks from heaven,
Come rarely with rushing of wings;
We are conscious at times we have striven,
Though seldom, to grasp better things;
These pass, leaving hearts that have falter'd,
Good angels with faces estranged,
And the skin of the Ethiop unalter'd,
And the spots of the leopard unchanged.

Gordon was at his best in describing sporting events—horse-racing, coursing, hunting, etc. He wrote from experience, and had the rare gift of portraying animal psychology. At least, what he says seems correct. His description of a bull-fight involving the death of the toreador, who had been one of the actors in a drama of the heart, is a fine thing. The story, translated from the Spanish, is told in monologue by the two ladies, one a patrician and the other a muleteer's daughter. The former, who had loved wildly and too well, had been superseded by the latter. Then came the bull-fight. The discarded beauty, full of revenge and remorse, is eager for the death of her false lover, while her successor

ardently prays for his safety. He kills the first bull, but just misses the vital spot in the second. The woman scorned tells the sequel.

Hark! that shock like muffled thunder,
  Booming from the Pyrenees!
Both are down—the man is under—
  Now he struggles to his knees,
Now he sinks, his features leaden
  Sharpen rigidly and deaden,
Sands beneath him soak and redden,
  Skies above him spin and veer;
Through the doublet, torn and riven,
Where the stunted horn was driven,
Wells the life-blood.—We are even,
  Daughter of the muleteer!

This poem, "A Legend of Madrid," is, however, not so well known as the sporting poems, "How We Beat the Favourite," "Banker's Dream," etc., on which Gordon's Australian reputation is founded. They contain none of the Byronic musings that pervade his metaphysical verses.

No game was ever yet worth a rap
  For a rational man to play,
Into which no accident, no mishap,
  Could possibly find its way.

. . . . .

Oh! the vigour with which the air is rife!
  The spirit of joyous motion;
The fever, the fullness of animal life,
  Can be drain'd from no earthly potion!
The lungs with the living gas grow light,
  And the limbs feel the strength of ten,
While the chest expands with its madd'ning might,
  God's glorious oxygen.

Gordon's philosophy of life may be summed up in the following lines. As will appear later, they form

a curious commentary on his own short tragic existence. He died at thirty-seven—a fatal age for dejected poets. It claimed Burns, and Byron died at thirty-six.

Though the pitcher that goes to the sparkling rill
Too oft gets broken at last,
There are scores of others its place to fill
When its earth to the earth is cast;
Keep that pitcher at home, let it never roam,
But lie like a useless clod,
Yet sooner or later the hour will come
When its chips are thrown to the sod.

Is it wise, then, say, in the waning day,
When the vessel is cracked and old,
To cherish the battered potters' clay,
As though it were virgin gold?
Take care of yourself, dull, boorish elf,
Though prudent and safe you seem,
Your pitcher will break on the musty shelf,
And mine by the dazzling stream.

. . . . .

Look before you leap if you like, but if
You mean leaping, don't look long—
Or the weakest place will soon grow stiff
And the strongest doubly strong.

. . . . .

Boot and saddle, see, the slanting
Rays begin to fall,
Flinging lights and colours flaunting
Through the shadows tall.
Onward! onward! must we travel?
When will come the goal?
Riddle I may not unravel,
Cease to vex my soul.

Unforgotten! though we cumber
Earth, we work His will.
Shall we sleep through night's long slumber
Unforgotten still?

Onward ! onward ! toiling ever,
  Weary steps and slow,
Doubting oft, despairing never,
  To the goal we go !

Question not, but live and labour
  Till yon goal be won,
Helping every feeble neighbour,
  Seeking help from none ;
Life is mostly froth and bubble,
  Two things stand like stone,
Kindness in another's trouble,
  Courage in your own.

Gordon's experiences resembled those of many men of similar temperament. Clever, attractive, fearless, a born sportsman and starting life under favourable auspices, his career was marred by continued failures, disappointments, vain regrets, and forebodings. He had his successes, it is true. He was a wonderful horse-breaker and steeplechaser, and his poems were popular, but he was dogged by financial troubles and the consciousness that he was responsible for them. At last, after seeing his new book of poems through the press, he went into the bush and shot himself. No doubt his condition was partly due to injuries sustained in a riding accident a few months before, but the " deep down " cause was temperamental. The most powerful engine soon comes to grief if it has no efficient governor. Gordon lacked practical qualities, nor had he the saving grace of humour. In true Byronic fashion, he took himself seriously and suffered from that fatal mental disease, self-pity. This is displayed in striking fashion by these extracts from his two last poems, and sad reading they are :

Lay me low, my work is done;
I am weary. Lay me low,
Where the wild flowers woo the sun,
Where the balmy breezes blow,
Where the butterfly takes wing,
Where the aspens, drooping, grow,
Where the young birds chirp and sing—
I am weary, let me go.

I have striven hard and long
In the world's unequal fight,
Always to resist the wrong,
Always to maintain the right.
Always with a stubborn heart,
Taking, giving blow for blow;
Brother, I have played my part,
And am weary, let me go.

Shield and buckler, hang them up,
Drape the standards on the wall,
I have drained the mortal cup
To the finish, dregs and all;
When our work is done 'tis best,
Brother, best that we should go—
I am weary, let me rest,
I am weary, lay me low.

. . . . .

Because pale men in some tradition say
It is a God that would not have thee 'scape
The torture that He wills to be thy fate.
'Tis but a tyrant's dream, and born of hate;
Then, soul, be not disquieted with doubt;
Step to the brink—this hand shall let thee out.

Gordon was a true poet, although not a great one. In lyrical simple fashion he described sporting events and the sportsman's creed—fearlessness, comradeship, adventure, and the open-air life. That is the reason of his popularity in Australia, where all are sports-

men. I doubt whether his metaphysical poems make the same appeal. Australians are supposed to tend to fatalism. Perhaps most of them never consider the subject, or pass it by with a few more or less cynical observations. As a rule, the sportsman is not introspective or prone to self-analysis or metaphysics. Gordon's metaphysical poems contain no new ideas. The Greeks had the same perplexities. The three Fates, the daughters of the night, Clotho, the spinner of the thread of life, Lachesis, who twists it, and Atropos, who chops it off with her shears, might well have been his *dramatis personæ*. But his poems are significant because they display eternal problems in the environment of a new world, and because they were written by one who had spent his life in occupations not usually associated with speculations concerning the destinies of man.

WINSTON CHURCHILL

No man has been more criticized than Mr. Churchill. Some people excite criticism, and he is one of them. To repeat Princess Bibesco's clever epigram, "Winston digs up his faults and throws them at you, whereas most people leave you to do the digging." The details of his amazing career are well known. As yet only fifty-one, he has played many great parts —soldier, newspaper correspondent, author, painter, orator, aviator, politician, Cabinet Minister, and all with distinction. His war dispatches were brilliant. Before he was thirty he had written one of the best biographies in the language and sold it for £8,000. He early made a reputation as a speaker. He was a Cabinet Minister at thirty-two. For eighteen years he has taken a leading part in national affairs, and has been one of the storm centres in British politics. What are the qualities which have made it possible for him to do these great things?

First, his undoubted courage.

Second, his mental and physical energy. He is supposed to be delicate. His pallid face, due to a white skin, and his stooping shoulders are misleading. In fact, he is strong and muscular, with a vigorous and resilient nervous system, which enables him to

stand great strain and bear heavy mental burdens.

Third, his industry. He is a prodigious, painstaking, and tireless worker, with an active brain for planning, scheming, and contriving. Before he rises in the morning, he covers page after page with his neat handwriting, and this is only the prelude to his day's work. But he is energetic physically as well as mentally. Such strenuous recreations as polo appeal to him, and he was for some time an enthusiastic aviator. He is an omnivorous reader, with the art of picking out books that matter and the things that matter in books.

Fourth, his imagination. His teeming brain is full of original ideas about all sorts of subjects. Nothing is too great or too small to engage his attention.

Fifth, his logical powers. His mind is essentially logical, and he is always ready with convincing arguments to support his proposals or to defeat his opponents.

Sixth, his rhetorical powers. He is a master of rhetoric, or the art of arranging arguments so as to suit the purpose in hand.

Seventh, his power of words. He has a passion for sonorous phrases, and can make words glitter on the page like diamonds. In short, he has the rare gift of style. He will take any pains to find the right word, and when he hears a new one that takes his fancy will carefully store it away for future use.

Eighth, his remarkable factual and verbal memory, enabling him to remember dry facts or to reel off snatches of poetry, prose, or popular songs.

Ninth, his sense of humour.

Tenth, his confidence in himself and his opinions. Politicians regard themselves as social doctors. A doctor who has no confidence in his remedies is rarely a success, and so it is, I suppose, with politicians.

It may well be asked how it is that so gifted a man does not enjoy universal confidence. The answer is that some people distrust his judgment and regard him as too impulsive. The judgment of a politician is, however, a highly controversial question. His critics think him always wrong and his admirers invariably right. Unfortunately, there is no impartial tribunal to decide. We can only leave it to history, but even historians may not be impartial, or, if impartial, may not know the facts. When all is said, judgment is largely a matter of experience, and most people with strong opinions have to make their mistakes while gaining it. Perhaps Mr. Churchill is too prone to rely on logical argument. He takes a set of facts as he sees them, and argues with great and convincing power to a conclusion. But, as we all know, the practical affairs of life take strange and illogical courses. Practical problems differ from mathematical propositions. There is usually the one fact more, and the feasibility of human experiments cannot be gauged by logic or mathematics.

From the point of view of Eugenics, it would be interesting to analyse Mr. Churchill's qualities, in order to endeavour to trace them to his various distinguished ancestors. A descendant of the great Duke of Marlborough, he is the son of a brilliant

American lady, and to her great physical and mental vitality he no doubt owes much of his remarkable vigour. Mr. Churchill's conception of the State is characteristic. He is all for England—British trade and British prestige—the things that made the Empire. He is also for general happiness and contentment. He visualizes a well-fed, well-housed people with a gallant, intellectual, and debonair upper class, presided over by the Royal Family and a benevolent, all-wise Government. He loves the drama and pageantry of life—brave deeds, handsome men, beautiful women, and clever people who have done great things, or who, as he thinks, have the capacity to do them.

In private life Mr. Churchill has great qualities. He is a loyal and sterling friend and a delightful, amusing companion. He is blessed with a most charming wife to whom he is devoted, and he is an admirable father who takes the keenest interest in his children's education.

One of the most interesting political problems of the present day is: "What is Mr. Churchill's future?"

UNIVERSITY OF WINN
PORTAGE & BALMORA
WINNIPEG, MAN. R3
CANADA
DISCARDED

MIND AND BODY

Dr. Cotton, Medical Director of the New Jersey State Hospital, has made a remarkable contribution to that long and much-debated subject—the relation of body and mind.

Aristotle expressed the opinion that the solution of this all-important question depended upon a wider and more accurate knowledge of human functions. For 2,300 years little progress was made in solving the enigma. Religious and philosophical conceptions held the field, and it is only during recent years that physiologists have attacked the problem of how thoughts are manufactured in the human laboratory. The prevailing idea was that body and mind were distinct entities. Mind was not regarded as a function of the individual as a whole.

The early Christians, for example, believed that insanity was caused by the presence of an evil spirit which had entered the body and had to be driven out by violent methods. Strange as it may seem in these enlightened days, traces of this weird belief dominated the treatment of the insane until the beginning of the nineteenth century, when Tuke, the English Quaker, and Pinel, a Frenchman, initiated a new order of scientific treatment, based on the theory

that insanity is a disease. Before their time, physicians, when treating lunatics, prescribed so many lashes or other atrocities, in the same way as so many pills. The implications are obvious. Mind was mind, and body was body. If the patient was out of his mind, he had to be brought back by castigation and correction. No one imagined that mind and body were so intermingled that the illness of the former was due to some defect of the latter. Insanity was a disease of the spirit to be treated as such. Since Tuke and Pinel great progress had been made in the treatment of the insane, and Sir Frederick Mott and others have discovered that thought depends upon well-defined mechanical and chemical processes.

Now for Dr. Cotton and his little book, with its grim title, "The Defective Delinquent and Insane" (Oxford University Press). Dr. Cotton writes for medical men, but the book is easy reading for the laity. In short, this is what he tells us:

> Several types of insanity are admittedly due to brain injuries caused by disease. These are visible on post-mortem examination. The causes of other types are more obscure, because the brain gives no indication. In 1876, however, Sir George Savage, an English doctor, suggested that these types were due, in many cases, to chronic poisoning of the patient's system. This line of inquiry was developed by Rogèr, a Frenchman, Sir Frederick Mott, Dr. Hunter, Henry S. Upson, and others. The result has been a revolution in the treatment of certain prevalent types of insanity.

The removal of septic teeth or tonsils, or cleansing affected intestinal organs, often turns a lunatic into a sane person. This treatment has been carried out most successfully on a large scale by Dr. Cotton,

whose percentage of cures since its adoption has risen from 35 to 87 per cent. Most of the cures have proved permanent. Britain has not been behindhand, similar methods having been adopted at several of the great asylums, notably by Dr. Goodall at Cardiff and Dr. Graves at Birmingham. Unfortunately, many asylums are not suitably equipped with the necessary laboratories and staff. A movement is on foot to remedy this defect, and it is obvious that the expense would be more than recouped by the consequent reduction in the number of patients who would otherwise be a charge on the ratepayer.

That is one reason why, in future, lunatic asylums are to be called "Mental Hospitals." Instead of being places of detention only, they are to be regarded as curative establishments like other hospitals. There will, of course, continue to be a large number of incurable cases, but an impetus has been given to curative work, and a new field of effort opened for the mental specialist.

It is not my purpose to deal with the medical questions involved, although it is well that the public should be acquainted with these remarkable developments, which are of greater practical importance than the more widely advertised system of psychoanalysis, of which, as a curative process, Dr. Cotton, by the way, has a poor opinion. He believes that its use frequently diverts attention from underlying physical causes of mental disturbance. My object is to direct attention to the amazing and far-reaching results of these and similar discoveries. For instance,

Mr. Brown becomes insane, suffering from the delusion that he is King Solomon. His septic teeth are removed, and he at once comes to earth as Mr. Brown. Mrs. Smith suffers from the delusion that she is the Queen of Sheba. Her septic tonsils are cut out, and she is transferred from the Orient to her former humble life. Therefore, what is mind ?

Sir Frederick Mott, Dr. Cotton, and other scientists hold that thought, like other functions, is the result of physiological processes which determine its quality and character. It is impossible to deny the force of the reasons which lead to this conclusion. On the other hand, the generality of mankind still cling to the traditional theory, illogical though it may be in the light of modern discoveries, that mind is a separate and mystical entity. Perhaps the progress of science may throw still more light upon the problem. For example, the important part played by the ductless or endocrine glands in the work of the brain is a new discovery, and their functions in this respect are still imperfectly understood. Indeed, thirty years ago little was known of these organs, which dominate the whole body. Meanwhile we may ponder over the curious fact that although Aristotle showed the way 2,300 years ago, it is only recently that definite knowledge regarding the working of the mind has been forthcoming. Those who take a gloomy view of the progress of mankind may solace themselves with the thought that more great discoveries have been made in every branch of science during the past two hundred years than during the previous two thousand.

EDUCATIONAL MYSTERIES

The difficult art of teaching children has led to much theorizing. What type of man or woman should be aimed at? To achieve this object, what should be taught? And, last but not least, what should be the method of teaching? These are questions which have been discussed at prodigious length. When dealing with generalities, differences of opinion are unlikely regarding the first conundrum. Most people agree that the object should be to turn out a happy, efficient, cultured citizen, capable of exercising his or her faculties to the best advantage. When we come to putting these principles into practice, which naturally leads us to Conundrum 2, we are likely to be met with serious differences of opinion as to what is to be taught, and in what proportion and when. The settlement of the curriculum involves technical social and ethical questions of a perplexing character. My attention has again been directed to the fascinating subject of teaching methods (Conundrum 3) by the Suggestions to School Teachers issued by the Board of Education. This instructive little book, important alike to teachers, parents, and the community, can be bought for the modest sum of ninepence. It should be widely read. Before dis-

cussing it we must take a short excursion into the history of education, to ascertain on what ideas the Suggestions are based. There are three methods or a combination of three by which a child may be taught. The teacher can require his pupil to accept certain arbitrary statements as Gospel, or he can reason with him and endeavour to convince him as to the why and wherefore, or he can develop his powers of observation and leave him to point the moral or draw his own conclusions.

John Locke (1632–1704), the greatest of all British philosophers, was the first modern to protest against the arbitrary method and advocate the merits of educational reasoning. The Greeks had long before discussed the subject in much detail. In Locke's time, the arbitrary customs of the Church pervaded education—then, of course, limited to the select. Consequently the revolt against ecclesiastical authority extended into the educational domain. Locke urged that the judgment should be exercised in all matters and that the young should be taught to reason free from prejudice or the dictates of authority. Rousseau (1712–78) was the next educational landmark. A disciple of Locke, he went a step farther, by preaching that the child should not be reasoned with but allowed to draw its own conclusions from facts observed or communicated. In short, he preached the doctrine of self-expression, to use present-day educational jargon, in its most exaggerated form. According to his ideas, a small child should be left to grasp the meaning of things and

develop a moral code on its own account, as best it can. But Rousseau did not confine himself to adumbrating this fantastic system, in which, however, there was a kernel of truth. In eloquent terms he reiterated the advantages of mental, physical, and manual training, thus following the Greeks. As John Morley says, "He clothed education with the unction of religion."

Judged by its effects, the famous "Emile," in which his views were expounded, is perhaps the most important book on education. In his own inimitable fashion, this strange, and in some respects despicable, genius enunciated doctrines which have been universally adopted, and others which have strongly tinged educational practice throughout the civilized world. The futility of Rousseau's system unadulterated has often been pointed out. There is no justification for robbing children of the accumulated experiences of mankind or allowing them to form wrong impressions which later they will have to scrap. The limited experiences of childhood do not always suggest moral reflections. The youthful observer might often come to the conclusion that honesty is not the best policy if it were not for the continued reiteration of the injunction, "Thou shalt not steal."

As Stern (a German) says in "Psychology of Early Childhood" (Allen & Unwin, 16*s.*):

> It is especially in early childhood impossible to leave to the child the self-creation of his judgments; and thus in all questions of importance suggestion will hold its rightful place in training.

For instance. As the child climbs some hill he perhaps notices that in different places the trees grow differently. His teacher shows the connection by explaining the influence of wind and weather, and thereby incites the child to keep an open eye for other proofs of this.

Recently I noticed in the *Humorist* a story about an uncle who told a small niece who had hurt herself that she would soon be right as a trivet. "But what is a trivet?" asked the weeping child. How could she be expected to ascertain by the light of Nature?

The next educational reformer was Pestalozzi (1746–1827), a lovable but inefficient Swiss, who, developing Rousseau's ideas, preached the irrefragable doctrine that the best method of training the child-mind is to cultivate the powers of observation from the cradle onwards. As he truly said, faculties are developed by exercise. Pestalozzi was followed by the Germans, Hebart (1776–1841) and Froebel (1782–1852). Hebart taught the necessity of developing the child instead of leaving it to develop itself, while Froebel, on the other hand, again following Rousseau, insisted that young children should be allowed to develop spontaneously, and that the work of the teacher is not to supply instruction but material in the shape of toys, etc., to enable the child to educate itself. The child is not to be supplied with answers to its questions, but furnished with the means of finding the answers. (Froebel's "Education of Man.") Even Mr. Squeers seems to have had a glimmering of this doctrine. See the explanation of his method. "'Now, then, where's the first boy?' 'Please, sir, he's cleaning the back

parlour window,' said the temporary head of the philosophical class. 'So he is to be sure,' rejoined Mr. Squeers. 'We go upon the practical mode of teaching: c-l-e-a-n, clean, verb active, to make bright, to scour. W-i-n, win, d-e-r, der, winder, a casement. When the boy knows this out of a book, he goes and does it.'" Herbert Spencer (1820–1903), in his book on Education (Williams and Norgate), urged that teaching methods should follow psychological lines based on the normal development of the mind. The various and varying theories described have dominated education for the last fifty years, but we may assume there has been a general movement in the direction of Rousseau with marked limitations. Now we come to the Suggestions. The two following passages comprise the pith of the Board's advice on method:

The main difficulty of the teacher lies in reconciling two principles which may appear to conflict. On the one hand he has to encourage initiative and self-reliance; on the other he has to maintain the control without which his school cannot exist as an organized body. In the past the balance inclined too much in favour of control, and rewards and punishments, especially punishments, usurped an undue place in school routine. In recent years there has been a marked change, and some critics maintain that the movement in favour of freedom has gone too far. . . . It is sufficient to recall a few accepted truths. One is that the better the school, the less the punishment of any kind, especially corporal punishment; another that no teacher should hesitate to punish, sufficiently and deliberately, where it is necessary to secure obedience or to mark the seriousness of an offence. Those familiar with school-work know well how strong among children is the temptation to faults which tend to undermine character, and which the teacher alone can prevent. To secure quick response to orders, scrupulous honesty, and the habit of steady and thorough concen-

tration, requires in the teacher energy, vigilance, and a sense of humour.

Self-education should be the key-note of the older children's curriculum, just as free expression is of the youngest children's ; but in neither case is it expected that the teacher will abdicate.

When dealing with the work of the Junior Stage, the Board deprecate rigid adherence to the systems of educational theorists. They advise, however, that little children should not be submitted to " irksome and useless drudgery," but trained by means of games, pictures, stories, manual exercises, country walks, etc. The Suggestions convey the general impression that the Board favour a sane compromise between the various theories. Self-expression and self-education are to be encouraged on the one hand, while on the other direct instruction is to be given in due proportion and discipline maintained. It is, however, doubtful whether any settled policy will be universally adopted, as, apart from the code, each educational area is a unit and each school a unit within a unit.

Educational strategy and tactics designed to conquer the child-mind present a strange anomaly. All grown-ups have been children, but the gulf between them is such that the former are apt to regard the latter as an inscrutable mystery. They have forgotten, or dimly remember, their own childish experiences. Consequently they have no guide-posts. As some one cleverly says, " It is our own shadow that obscures the child as we talk to him." Systems have their value, but the teacher is the most important factor. The art of addressing children is obviously

closely bound up with educational methods. The objects of the teacher and speaker are similar. Both desire to secure and maintain the attention of a juvenile audience. Children are ruthless critics, and if not interested soon become passive resisters by ceasing to pay attention.

The other day I bought a little book, "The Art of Addressing Children" (Clarke & Co., 4*s.* 6*d.*), by Mr. Jeffs. It contains many useful suggestions regarding this elusive type of oratory, but, considering the author's wide experience, he might have been more explicit. Perhaps in his next edition he will be. Meanwhile, I will try to furnish a few hints gathered from various sources.

Sympathy and understanding are the essentials. Therefore the speaker must do his best to dispel the feeling of aloofness. It is important to secure attention at the start. The best method is to arouse curiosity, next to imitation the dominant characteristic of childhood. This need not be done in a crude or blatant fashion. Much depends on voice and manner. Children delight to help and find things out for themselves. Therefore, when possible, the speaker should give the opportunity. Just as they like bright colours, children prefer animated speakers keenly interested in the performance. They are good judges of character and quick to note the absence of enthusiasm. Long words and involved sentences are fatal. Unfamiliar words should be briefly explained, but speeches interlarded with such explanations are certain failures. Simplicity, directness, and

clarity are the key-notes. There is another reason why they should be. Children learn to speak by imitation. Consequently those who address them should endeavour not only to express their thoughts clearly and in apt language, but to enunciate so as to set a good example. This is specially important when addressing young children under seven, the most receptive age. Interesting repetition is essential in most cases. The idea must be repeated several times. Abstract statements should be avoided. Children reason from the simple to the complex. They prefer to hear about persons, things, or animals real or imaginary. As pointed out in the Suggestions (Teaching of History), children can easily be led to take an interest in historical events if taught in connection with the lives of the chief actors in the drama. Homely illustration is another necessary, but difficult, art. Children like to make a comparison with something they know and understand. Needless to say, they love stories. The child is a curious mixture of fantasy and the practical. It lives for a great part in an imaginary world of its own, in which the actors do everyday things in an odd sort of way. Hans Andersen, Lewis Carroll, Edward Lear, Barrie, Kenneth Grahame (" The Golden Age "), and Algernon Blackwood (" Education of Uncle Paul ") are masters of the art of make-believe. Few speakers possess the gift of entering into the spirit of this magic world. Even those who have the gift when talking to their own children are painfully self-conscious when speaking to a larger and unknown audience. Children

have a strong sense of broad humour, or, perhaps, it would be better to say, the ridiculous. They delight in mock misfortunes of other people. The clown, Punch and Judy, and knock-about artistes are the favourites. Charlie Chaplin's knavish tricks, as depicted on the films, are the chief source of his popularity. This rather casts doubt on the dogma, of Rousseau, shared by Lord Palmerston, that a child is born good.

The nature of children's humour makes it difficult for a speaker to appeal to them unless he indulges in mimicry or is assisted by stage properties. But some people have the gift of talking about childish things in a way certain to produce a hearty laugh. This, however, involves a knowledge of youthful occupations and the child-mind which is extremely rare.

Regarding the use by the speaker of extracts from poems, children's appreciation of poetry is a subject which has occasioned much discussion. As the Suggestions remark :

> Nothing in the teaching of English requires more discretion on the part of the teacher than the choice and treatment of suitable poems. . . . The main story or leading idea of a poem should be within the children's grasp, and a well-marked rhythm and swinging metre are most valuable aids. Poetry which concerns itself in any abstract form with the deeper questions of human experience, *e.g.*, of love or death, is unintelligible to children.

No speech to children should last for more than fifteen minutes, unless brightened by skilful sketches on a blackboard or some other graphic device. Indeed, some experts say it is impossible to hold the attention

of children for even such a brief period unless the speaker engages in collective questioning, which has the advantage of brightening up the audience and enabling the orator to ascertain whether he is on right lines. Some speakers invite questions—a dangerous expedient, as the Bishop found when floored by the small boy who asked how many legs a caterpillar had.

"A BIRD'S-EYE VIEW OF INDIA"

INDIA is an enigma—vast, mysterious, and romantic. Except in generalities, most of us know very little about it. Space has not been annihilated by books, newspapers, telegraphs, telephones, cinemas, and wireless. To comprehend a country even slightly you must visit it. So far as I can understand, only about 2 per cent. of our population have had the advantage of seeing India. Therefore it is not surprising that we have the habit of speaking as if it were a country like France or Italy instead of a continent or congerie of countries like Europe. We are apt to forget that India has a population of some 320,000,000, composed of different races, speaking different languages, and practising different religions. We are also apt to forget the far-reaching results of caste—a social system under which every Hindu is born into a group which, for life, defines his occupation, mode of life, and marriage limitations. During recent years these rules have been relaxed, but they still permeate the lives of the Indian people. It is difficult to realize that 50,000,000 Hindus are looked upon by the castes above them as "untouchable." Touching them, or even coming into remote contact with them, involves ceremonial defilement.

Well may they be called "the depressed people." I heard Mr. Sastri give an eloquent description of the stifling effects of caste to an appreciative audience of American newspaper men, who left the Conference hot-footed with good copy. Very little appeared, however. America has her own caste problems, due to the presence of 10,000,000 negroes.

Lord Ronaldshay's bird's-eye view of India comes as a useful and timely corrective of hazy ideas. ("India: A Bird's-Eye View." Constable, 18*s*.) Before dealing with it I must say a few words regarding the author. Lord Ronaldshay is a renowned Eastern traveller and President of that remarkable but little-known institution the Royal Geographical Society. London abounds with wonderful things. An epic might be written on its intellectual oases devoted to the study and discussion of various branches of science and literature. The Geographical Society is one of these. The exterior of its stately club-house in Kensington Gore suggests no connection with Mount Everest and other remote and inaccessible places, but when the spectator goes inside and wanders through the great library of books on travel and geography, when he examines the unique collection of photographs and maps, and when he reads with patriotic pride the names of the travellers and explorers upon whom the Society has conferred its gold medal, he realizes that this quiet old mansion is the home of the spirit of adventure and exploration bequeathed by Queen Elizabeth, Lord Leicester, Drake, Frobisher,

Hawkins, Sir Walter Raleigh, Captain Cook, Livingstone, and others like them.

If imaginative he may think it a romance that a learned Society housed peacefully in Kensington Gore should attempt to tear away the veil that shrouds the mysteries of Mount Everest.

Now for India. If the doctrine of transmigration of souls is true, Lord Ronaldshay was probably an eagle in a former phase of his existence. He has the " bird's-eye " gift, which enables him to produce panoramic pictures. For instance :

> Imagine a region the size of all Europe exclusive only of Russia, stretching over twenty-eight degrees of latitude and forty degrees of longitude, with a population of 320,000,000 . . . practising nine great religions and speaking 130 different dialects belonging to six distinct families of speech. . . . When within the space of a few months one has been brought into contact with the business-like Parsi of Bombay, the indolent and easy-going Burman, the courtly and cultured Brahman of Southern India, the primitive Kohl or Bhil of the jungles of Central India, the emotional and subtle-minded inhabitant of the towns of Bengal, the cheery hill-man of the Eastern Himalayas, the great landholders of the United Provinces and the Punjab, the proud aristocracy of Rajputana, the wild Afridi of the North-West Frontier, and the picturesque chieftain of Baluchistan, then it is that statistics as to race and language begin to assume definite meaning and reality.
>
> Wise men tell one that it is impossible to generalize about India. . . . One does not generalize about Europe, and in some respects Europe is more homogeneous than India. And, indeed, it does not require a man of outstanding wisdom to tell one that in the case of a region stretching over forty degrees of longitude and twenty-eight degrees of latitude, generalizations are only likely to hold good, subject to large qualifications. Nevertheless, there are certain rough generalizations which may be made. Thus it may be said that India is essentially an agricultural country. . . . 72 per cent. of the population, or approximately 219,000,000,

are dependent upon agriculture in one form or another for their livelihood. The population as a whole lives in small country towns and villages. There are in the whole of the continent less than 750 towns with a population of 10,000, and only thirty towns with a population of 100,000 and upwards.

Again, take the case of climate. It may be said in a general way that India is a hot country ; and the fact that there are parts of India where cold weather is experienced during certain seasons, and other parts where a winter of almost arctic severity prevails, does not disprove the general contention. If India were not a hot country, it is unlikely that her people would consume round about 2,000,000 miles of cotton cloth every year, as in point of fact they do. In the year 1913–14 they took from the looms of Great Britain alone over 1,750,000 miles of grey, white, and coloured cloth.

The history of the British conquest of India is an attractive subject. Lord Ronaldshay says very little about it. The story goes back to 1600, when Queen Elizabeth established the East India Company. At that time the Portuguese had monopolized Eastern trade for a century. They were expelled by the Elizabethan sailors.

For 150 years the Company traded in competition with the French and Dutch, who were ejected by Clive and Warren Hastings, the founders of British India, who not only defeated our competitors but subjugated vast territories. They got little thanks for what they did. During the succeeding 150 years, by a series of native wars and negotiations, British India was made what it is to-day. But let us look at the peaceful side of British achievement. To quote Lord Ronaldshay :

What we actually exercise control over is, a continent the size of all Europe, excluding only Russia, with a population of 320,000,000 people. Rather less than two-fifths of this area, and

rather less than one-fourth of the total population, is administered and governed under British suzerainty by the rulers of 700 different native States; the remainder is administered directly by us. And the whole of this vast machinery necessary for this stupendous task is directed, controlled, and kept in motion by a body of officials of all kinds—civilians, judges, engineers, doctors, educationists, forest officers, and so on, of whom the number of Englishmen has at all times been less than 5,000.

In more detail, Britain has given India a powerful and efficient Government which has suppressed racial and religious warfare and organized this vast continent in a manner almost miraculous. Administrative areas have been formed, a great judicial system has been set up, communications have been improved by the construction of roads and 36,000 miles of railways, there is an efficient and far-reaching postal system, huge irrigation works have been carried out, agriculture has been improved, industries have been created, mines and oil-wells have been sunk; primary and secondary schools, universities, and medical colleges have been established, although as yet only 6 per cent. of the population can read and write; tropical diseases have been mitigated by the discoveries of British scientists and the action of the medical department; Indian customs, repugnant to humane ideas, have been abolished; 25,000 co-operative societies have been formed, the land system has been modernized and simplified, and an equitable system of finance and taxation established.

History relates no greater triumph of government or organization. Food and pestilence are India's practical problems, and although in many respects

Eastern civilization may equal that of the West, there can be no doubt that British rule has conferred untold benefits upon India by increasing productivity and stamping out disease.

Now we come to a vital question: the method of government. When the administrative powers of the East India Company were transferred to the Crown in 1858, it was provided that India should be governed in London by a Secretary of State assisted by a Council and in India by a Governor-General or Viceroy assisted by a small Council or Cabinet consisting of officials. The Provincial governments were organized on similar lines. This system continued until 1909, when, in consequence of agitation by the educated classes, Lord Morley, the Secretary of State, and Lord Minto, the Viceroy, determined upon a measure of representative government comprised in the Indian Councils Act.

Lord Morley, however, stated emphatically that India was not ready for Parliamentary institutions, and that he would take no part in granting them. The scheme established by the Act provided for an increase in the size of the Legislative Councils, that of the Viceroy being increased to sixty-eight members. The additional members were to be nominated by representative bodies, such as chambers of commerce, municipalities, universities, etc., so as to secure representatives of different classes. The powers of the Councils were limited to discussions and recommendations which the Government were under no obligation to observe.

For a time this system worked fairly well and seemed to give satisfaction. Then came renewed agitation and a demand for Home Rule, led by Mrs. Besant and Mr. Tilak.

The next step was the report of 1918 by Mr. Montagu, Secretary of State, and Lord Chelmsford, Viceroy, making proposals for a new Constitution. With modifications these became the basis of the Government of India Act, 1919, which still holds the field. Few more important measures are recorded in the history of the Empire. Roughly the scheme is as follows : 5,000,000 of the population have been enfranchised on a property qualification. These elect the larger proportion of the members of the Central and Provincial legislatures, the size of which has been much increased.

The electors also appoint the new Central Council of State, which constitutes the Upper Chamber. The remaining members of all these bodies are nominated by the Executive Government, which is irremovable, but the elected members are in a majority. In the Provincial assemblies a strange plan bearing the sinister name " dyarchy " has been established. Under this the functions of the legislatures have been divided into two categories. The elected members deal with subjects such as education and public health, while the nominated members control the police, the administration of justice, and similar matters. Each Provincial legislature has its own cabinet selected from the elected body and its own revenue administered jointly by both bodies.

The Governor is the keystone of these complicated arrangements. The Central Government has not been burdened with dyarchy, but the Viceroy has extensive powers of veto and legislation when deemed necessary for public safety or welfare. Bills must be passed by both Houses, who in case of difference meet in joint session.

Subject to overriding powers vested in the Viceroy and exceptions including military expenditure, the Central Councils control finance, the Central Government having its own revenue. Contemporaneously with these vast changes local self-government is to be established and the Civil Service "Indianized" by raising the proportion of Indians to 33 per cent., increasing in ten years to 48 per cent. The educational service will contain a much larger proportion. These arrangements are to be reconsidered in 1929. Now, however, insistent demands are being made for further concessions in the shape of Dominion Home Rule, which would mean placing India on the same footing as Canada or Australia. The British Government have declined to accede to these proposals, but the agitation still continues. How it will develop remains to be seen.

Lord Meston, the well-known Anglo-Indian, in his introduction to Mr. Gwynn's "Indian Politics" (Nisbet, 12*s.* 6*d.*), says we are faced with the necessity for making the most momentous decision we have ever had to take in India, a decision which cannot be postponed, and for which every one in this country must share responsibility. He points out that three

courses are open—(1) to suppress agitation by force, (2) to give India Home Rule and let her take the consequences, and (3) stick to our plan of training India in democracy until she gains reasonable experience.

Mr. Gwynn says instructive things on these points that are well worth reading. Meanwhile the position may be summed up thus: In accordance with our modern Colonial policy we have declared that representative government is desirable for India, but that it must be gradually applied, so that Indians may learn the art.

Two doses have been given in ten years, dose No. 2 being compounded of dyarchy and other curious drugs of uncertain action not to be found in the recognized constitutional pharmacopœia. Apparently the effect has been to transfer to a small section of the Indian community the major part of administration, including education. How this will operate on a continent comprising 320,000,000 inhabitants hide-bound by tradition, speaking different languages, practising different religions, and one-fifth living in Native States, no one can tell, but some express doubts whether Western ideas of government are suited to such a country, particularly when it is remembered that racial and religious animosities are still fierce as ever.

Lord Meston emphasizes what must be apparent to all—viz., that no guidance can be obtained from experiences elsewhere. No analogy can be drawn from the failure of our Colonial policy in dealing with

the Pilgrim Fathers and the success of our revised method in dealing with Canada and Australia. The special qualities of Indian psychology are, of course, important factors. Lord Ronaldshay says the Indian is a fatalist and a pessimist. This he ascribes partly to climate and partly to religion and philosophic tradition. If he is right, the prospects for an efficient democracy do not seem promising. Perhaps cynics would contend, however, that pessimistic fatalism is advantageous.

In conclusion, the Indian Army, upon which in the final issue law and order depend, numbers some 230,000, of which about 66,000 are British troops. Recent regulations provide for increasing the number of Indian officers, but it is understood that very few have availed themselves of these facilities. Luckily, India is said to be quiet and prosperous, notwithstanding political convolutions, repercussions, and rumblings.

FROM BELSIZE PARK TO A GOLDEN HOWDAH

Romance lurks in strange places. Belsize Park, for example, with its solid, comfortable, mid-Victorian houses, does not look a romantic spot. Nevertheless, it has its romance, for here Rufus Isaacs, now Lord Reading, Viceroy of India, resided during his boyhood and early manhood. It is recorded in the newspapers that he has just shot six tigers, one eleven feet long. That made me think of Belsize Park. What his ambitions were in his early days does not appear—probably they were not startling—but it is certain that the City men who sat side by side with the handsome young Jew on the knife-board of the Hampstead omnibus never imagined that he was destined to become Attorney-General, Lord Chief Justice, Ambassador to America, and finally Viceroy of the Indian Empire.

Although, as explained, appearances do not favour such a theory, I am inclined to think that Belsize Park must have been a hotbed of romance. Mrs. Isaacs, senior, was a true romantic, with a consuming passion for English and French fiction which she gratified on every possible occasion. Her husband, on the contrary, was an able business man. His son

early displayed romantic tendencies by falling violently in love with a charming young lady whose parents did not favour the matrimonial aspirations of a youth with little money and no tangible prospects. Like the City gentleman on the knife-board, they could not foresee what was in store for this ardent lover. Mr. Isaacs, senior, scenting danger, banished his son by packing him off as an apprentice on a tramp steamer. With his little legacy of love-letters next his heart, young Rufus Isaacs set out on his travels, feeling, like thousands more have done in similar circumstances, that all prospects of happiness were ended and that early death was the only relief from intolerable anguish.

However, after undergoing many hardships, at the expiration of some twelve months, during which he visited the Argentine, India, and other foreign parts, he returned to London and entered his father's business. Of this he soon tired, not having any liking for convoying cargoes of fruit from continental ports. Then he joined the Stock Exchange, where he remained for several years. His next idea was to try his luck in America, so one morning early he left home for Euston, *en route* for Liverpool and New York. However, his mother's tears caused her husband to dispatch two of his other sons to Euston to retrieve Rufus. On hearing of his mother's grief he abandoned his intention and returned home. His mother then begged him to read for the Bar. Luckily for himself, he took her advice, and thus began a great career. He was called in 1887 at the age of twenty-

seven, and before long secured a lucrative practice. He took silk in 1898, and speedily became a fashionable leader.

His popularity and success may be estimated from the fact that his income amounted for some years to £30,000—in his day a colossal figure. Sir John Simon's income is said to be much larger, but fees are now charged on a more liberal scale than formerly. In 1904 Mr. Rufus Isaacs entered Parliament, and six years later became Attorney-General. At this time he was the trusted confidant of both Mr. Asquith and Mr. Lloyd George, and one of the recognized leaders of the Liberal Party. Lord Fisher used to say that life is strewn with orange peel. In 1913 Sir Rufus Isaacs experienced the truth of this wise epigram in connection with the Marconi case. Having successfully surmounted his difficulties, he became Lord Chief Justice in the following year at the age of fifty-three, the successor of a brilliant line of great men.

On his appointment as Lord Chief Justice, he was made a peer under the title of Lord Reading. Then came the war, during which he played many great parts. He became a member of Mr. Asquith's Cabinet, and one of his most trusted advisers; he was Mr. Lloyd George's coadjutor at the Treasury, and later went to America as Ambassador, in which capacity he conducted the negotiations with President Wilson which led to America joining the Allies. After the war Lord Reading returned to the Bench, having received first a viscountcy and then an earldom for

his services. In 1921 he was appointed Viceroy of India, the ruler of 250,000,000 people and head of one of the most ceremonious and dignified Courts in the world.

After this amazing story, which reads like a tale by Dumas, who shall say that Belsize Park is without romance? Could any of Mrs. Isaacs's novels have had a more unlikely and extravagant plot? Strangely, Lord Reading himself is only half a romantic. There are two Lord Readings—one the adventurous, restless spirit which has made him what he is, and the other the cautious, conventional, reserved lawyer. Lord Northcliffe had similar characteristics. He was half romantic and half business man. It is curious that both he and Lord Reading should have hailed from Hampstead.

These two interesting personalities raise a nice problem in eugenics. Lord Reading had an energetic, businesslike father and an easygoing, romantic mother. Lord Northcliffe, on the other hand, had an easygoing father and an energetic and businesslike mother. Both were members of large families. Mr. and Mrs. Harmsworth had fourteen children and Mr. and Mrs. Isaacs nine. Apart from temperament and ambition, Rufus Isaacs possessed many great implements for carving his way through the jungle to success—a dominating and ingratiating personality—enormous mental and physical drive that enabled him to work longer and harder than his competitors. The capacity to work continuously on a ration of four hours' sleep is rare. He had it. A wonderful memory—a

handsome person—and a sonorous musical voice. At one time, by the way, he meditated becoming a professional singer.

Although a Jew, he much resembles that great Scot, Lord Mansfield, in appearance, as you may see by comparing his photograph with the picture and statue of Lord Mansfield at the Guildhall. Quickness of apprehension and the power to grasp complicated facts and figures—an even temper—a kindly disposition—the genius for friendship—great gifts as a negotiator—wit, humour, the power of words and of silence.

At the Bar, Lord Reading was a discursive but effective speaker. To quote Lord Fisher again, "Reiteration leads to conviction." Lord Reading's success as an advocate was due to the art of selecting and reiterating the right points. His greatest forensic effort was the defence of the late Lord Russell, editor of the *Liverpool Post*, in a charge for criminal libel. An examination of the shorthand notes of the trial will show that when speaking Lord Reading paid but little attention to form. His sole objective was to convince the jury. During recent years he has changed his style to suit his present requirements. He has become at once more concise and more oratorical.

Of his powers as an administrator I cannot speak. India is too far off and questions of Indian administration too controversial. We may be sure, however, that with characteristic industry and energy he has done his best. Lord Reading is not bookish. His

mind does not run that way. All his life he has been a man of action. He possesses the knowledge and experience which come from wide travel and varied dealings with men and things.

Our hero's abounding animal spirits have been one of his greatest assets. Some years ago I heard the question put to a number of distinguished men: "Would you care to re-live your life exactly as you have lived it, *i.e.*, to repeat all your experiences?" The only one who replied in the affirmative was Rufus Isaacs. I wonder whether he would now give the same answer?

But the reader will be saying, "Enough of these analytical disquisitions! Let us get back to the romance! You have not yet told us whether he married the girl after all!" In the interests of romanticism, I regret to have to reply in the negative. The lady married another!

Lord Reading, however, has no cause to complain of the turn of events. He has been fortunate in his married life, and is a devoted husband—one of those husbands who make a point of going home to tea with their wives on every possible occasion. The "home to tea whenever possible" habit is a great test of domestic felicity. One Saturday I called upon Lord and Lady Reading at tea-time and found them seated together more like two lovers than two middle-aged married people. They reminded me of a little story Alfred Lyttelton told me about Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone in their extreme old age. Arriving at their house one evening rather early for dinner, and being

a relative of the family, he went to the drawing-room, which he found in darkness except for the fire. On turning up the lights he saw the old couple seated quietly on the sofa hand in hand.

THE REAL KARL MARX

When Lenin remarked that ideas were more explosive than rifles, probably he had in mind the theories of Karl Marx (1818–83), the man with the "black velvet" voice whose disciple he was. Marx's ideas have exploded with a vengeance, but in some instances with astonishing results, so that Lenin might have added with advantage that, unlike rifles, ideas are not weapons of precision. It is impossible to predict with accuracy what the effects of the explosion will be. The history of the Marxian creed is a romance. Conceived and brought forth in garrets, its spirit has permeated the civilized world, although its details are imperfectly understood. Incidentally it has produced and shaped the greatest revolution in history, taking population and area affected as the standard. Therefore it may be interesting to describe what he taught and who and what he was.

Marx's theories were conceived in the revolutionary atmosphere of the 'forties, when the terrors of industrialism had not been mitigated by trade unions, Factory Acts, and other measures to improve the position of the worker. He enunciated these doctrines :

I. That the social ideas and religious and political institutions of every epoch ultimately depend upon the method of producing and distributing commodities at that time, or in other words, upon economic conditions. Fundamental changes in the latter ultimately bring about fundamental changes in the former. For instance, the feudal system with its appurtenances in the shape of religion and ethics was due to the methods of production and distribution that obtained when it was created. This doctrine is termed the materialistic conception of history.

II. That societies are subject to a process of evolution by virtue of which the class created to carry on the particular method of production obtaining at the time ultimately supersedes the class by which it is created. Thus the feudal lords were superseded by their tenants and the latter by the commercial classes.

III. That the capitalist class appropriate so much of the products of labour as is not required for the sustenance of the workers. For instance, if 100 workers produce 500 pairs of boots in a week and another 100 produce 500 yards of linen in the same time, the boots and linen would be of equal value if, for purposes of illustration, the cost of raw material is excluded. Assume that the bootmakers require only 400 yards of linen for clothing purposes and the spinners require only 400 pairs of boots, the surplus in each case would be appropriated by their respective employers. This Marx called the law of surplus value. He taught, however, that it could not operate in individual cases as the surplus varies (though there may be none), but must be applied to industry as a whole. Therefore to secure the surplus value to the worker the instruments of production and distribution must be transferred to the State. Then there would be one class only, the workers or proletariat, who would divide between them the total products of their labour.

It may be a matter of surprise that these technical and somewhat highbrow theories should have formed the stock-in-trade of a revolutionary, that they should have captured the imagination of working-class leaders throughout the world, and that, consciously or unconsciously, they should have been adopted by vast numbers of people. While tradi-

tional politicians were devoting their attention to questions of the day, the ghost of Marx, like a modern Guy Fawkes, was quietly storing dynamite in the basements of most civilized States with the object of smashing up the existing order and starting afresh.

The popularity of Marxism is explained by the determination of the working classes to secure a greater share of the products of industry. Marx crystallized these ideas and emphasized their importance by teaching that, although obscured by tradition and convention, this is really a materialistic world depending for its religions, governments, and morals upon the manner in which the necessities of life are produced. The effects of the modern movement are obvious. To-day the proportions in which the proceeds of industry are to be divided between employers and employed, and the manner in which industry is to be controlled, are the outstanding problems.

Marx developed his theory concerning the evolution of societies by teaching that the time was ripe for a fresh development. He argued thus : Increased competition involves the use of larger and ever-increasing fixed capital, leading to the concentration of capital in a few hands. These undertakings employ vast numbers of workers (the proletariat). The increase of population helps the capitalist to lower wages and the condition of the proletariat is one of ever-increasing misery. The workers, however, become organized and develop class consciousness—viz., a recognition of their rights as opposed

to those of other classes. These conflicting forces make the industrial machine unwieldy and it staggers to its doom. The industrial weapon in the shape of the down-trodden proletariat forged by the capitalists for their own purposes has by the process of evolution proved the dominating factor. Therefore the proletariat should revolt and, having seized the government by the aid of the lower middle class, should then demolish their allies, when there will be only one class, who will enter into possession of the surplus value previously enjoyed by their oppressors. The movement is not to be confined to any one country. It is to be international.

Events have shown that some at least of Marx's theories were inaccurate. Instead of becoming more concentrated, capital has been more widely distributed, and, instead of deteriorating, the condition of the working classes has greatly improved.

The English edition of his chief work, "Capital," was issued in 1886. In the preface his co-author, Frederick Engels, committed himself to the statement that British prosperity seemed to have run its course, that we were landed in "the slough of a permanent and chronic depression," and that the increase of population would shortly lead to a revolution. Thirty-nine years have passed during which the nation has been more prosperous than ever, while although the population has increased by some twelve millions, the number of unemployed is not substantially greater than in 1886.

The chief defect of Marx's theories is his failure

to recognize the complexity of the modern State and that commodities are not produced and distributed by one class only. His famous Communist manifesto of 1847 contained an eloquent eulogy of the industrial achievements of the middle classes during the previous 100 years. He said they had transformed the world, and described them as the most wonderful race in history, far transcending the Egyptians, Greeks, or Romans. He predicted, however, that their "number was up," and called upon the workers to shake off their chains and seize the inheritance in the shape of the surplus value appropriated by the managerial and capitalist classes. Notwithstanding his admiration of the invention, resource, enterprise, and energy of the so-called middle classes, Marx failed to appreciate that men possessing these qualities are essential parts of the industrial machine, and that their incentives are personal gain and personal ambition.

According to him, surplus value or wealth is produced only by what he called simple labour. He did not take into account the creative work of chemists, inventors, physicists, and organizers who place new methods at the disposal of mankind or organize industry so as to increase the productivity of labour. His theory disregarded the value of the invention of the locomotive, the electric telegraph, printing machinery, spinning machinery, the telephone, and the myriads of other appliances that have changed the face of the world. It also disregarded the necessity of leadership in industry. Indeed, we must

confess that Marx had no practical knowledge of things. He was a theorist only. The history of his ideas is interesting. It is strange that Adam Smith and Ricardo, the British political economists, are indirectly responsible for the Russian Soviet State. Little did they think that their ideas would explode in such an unexpected fashion. It arose in this way. Adam Smith laid down that labour is the source of all wealth and the real measure of the exchangeable value of all commodities ("Wealth of Nations," 1776). In 1817 Ricardo (1772–1823) published his "Political Economy," in which he stated that the worker receives as wages only so much as is required to furnish him with the necessities of life estimated according to the custom of the time.

Marx based his theories for the reconstruction of Society upon a narrow interpretation of these propositions. As stated already, commodities are not produced by the labour of any one class. You cannot rule out scientists, managers, accountants, sea captains, doctors, schoolmasters, and all the other classes who render essential services. In fixing the exchange value of commodities, the cost of their labour must be taken into account. Furthermore, wages are not exclusively based on the cost of the necessities of life, and if they were it is obvious that the term "necessities" is elastic. Nor can the value of labour be measured by time. The skilled worker may do more useful work in an hour than an unskilled worker would do in a week. But, assuming that a scheme could be devised for valuing different classes

of work so as to admit of a fair exchange, how could it be applied to a vast population largely dependent for its existence upon conditions prevailing in foreign countries ? Unhappily, the world is peopled by men and not by angels.

Marx was an internationalist, and the co-operation of the working classes of all countries was an essential part of his plan. To further his ideas he founded in 1864 the International Union of Working Men, the parent of the Internationals of more recent years. In this respect his ideals have not been realized. To-day nationalism is more rampant than ever. The American Labour Party, for instance, have gone the length of passing immigration laws which exclude from the United States all but a limited number of favoured individuals. An examination of Marx's history shows that he was a cosmopolitan with an inadequate appreciation of the sentiments of the ordinary commonplace citizen. His birthplace was Trèves, Prussia. He was half Jewish and half Dutch, his father being a Jewish lawyer and his mother a Dutchwoman. Six years after Marx was born his father became a Christian. Marx went a step farther by cordially hating Jews. The reason is not stated. Perhaps he regarded them as the most successful exponents of the system he attacked with such virulence. He was well educated at Bonn and Berlin, and early took a keen interest in economic and political questions. In 1842, at the age of twenty-four, he became editor of a Radical newspaper in Cologne, but it was soon suppressed by the Govern-

ment. Then he moved to Paris, where he continued his economic studies and journalistic work. In 1845 he was expelled from Paris. After this he went to Brussels, where, in conjunction with Frederick Engels, he planned a series of European revolutions to subvert the existing order.

Secret societies were formed in London, Paris, Brussels, and elsewhere. In 1848 insurrections broke out in France and Germany. Marx and Engels returned to France, then they moved to Prussia. From Prussia they were expelled. Then they returned to Paris. Being forbidden to remain, they came to London in 1849. Marx stayed there until he died in 1883. For years he lived in Soho in great financial straits, but later Engels, who was a wealthy man, allowed him £350 per annum, which enabled him to continue his literary work. His chief book, "Capital," was published in 1867. It is not exciting reading, but its teachings diluted and embellished have been spread in all civilized countries by devoted adherents. Marx is a fascinating psychological study. He was a rare type. A fanatical theorist without sentiment. He preached class hatred because he believed that, according to inexorable economic and evolutionary laws, one class was bound to destroy another. He did not preach revolution only. One class may revolt against another without hating it. People with conflicting interests need not necessarily hate each other. But it was part and parcel of Marx's theories that one class should hate and exterminate the other.

With all his defects Marx will be a great historic character. It would suffice if his fame were based on the fact that the Russian Revolution was carried out in strict accordance with his ideas. As we have seen, his influence was far wider. Without political or Press support this penniless cosmopolitan from his garrets in Soho captured the imagination of the Labour world in all civilized countries. It is immaterial that his star has been eclipsed by the failure of his schemes in practical operation. The point is that he was able to get them put into operation. His success was, of course, due to the intolerable injustices of the industrial system during the first three-quarters of the last century. Owing to various causes things have changed and are changing for the better. Injustices, however, still flourish, but it is questionable whether society can be reformed by any cut-and-dried plan. In conclusion, the reader will no doubt have discovered that there is a strong clash between the ethical teachings of the New Testament and those of Marx. It remains to be seen which will prevail, goodwill or force. In the interests of humanity let us hope the former.

[See "Marx's Theory of Value," by Josephs (Oxford University Press, 4*s.* 6*d.* net), and "Life and Teachings of Marx," by Beer (Leonard Parsons, 3*s.* 6*d.*).]

WHAT AMERICA WANTS

It must be confessed with regret that the British people are not much interested in the Presidents of the United States. As a rule they know their names, and that is all. For instance, before the war few people on this side knew President Wilson's history or what he stood for. Even now his views concerning capital and labour, which made him so much hated by influential people, are little known.

The growing importance of understanding America renders it essential that we should make a closer study of American Presidents. American politics are so elusive that it is almost impossible for a foreigner to comprehend them. It is more useful to ascertain the views of America's chief executive officer for the time being. Therefore I have read with much interest "The Price of Freedom" (Charles Scribner's Sons, 12*s.* 6*d.*), containing a selection of the speeches of President Calvin Coolidge. If widely read it would dispel much misunderstanding regarding American sentiments and ideals. Here we are unaccustomed to such speeches. Almost every line breathes American patriotism and American supremacy.

It (America) saved freedom from the hand of impending despotism in 1776 and 1917. Had the first been lost, where would have been the power of sacrifice by which the last was won?

Dedicated to this high purpose, America has marched on. There is her glorious history. There is her progress. There is her prosperity. There is the wonderful organization of her government, perfected in its ultimate decisions to reflect the will of the people. There is her system of education developed in accordance with the public schools established in Massachusetts in 1647. There is her transportation, superior to that of any other country. There is her banking organization, richer than any other on earth. There is her commerce, which flows to the world markets. There is her industrial plant, superior to that of any place or time. There is her agriculture, vast beyond the imagination to comprehend. At the end of the most exhausting of wars, which left the great nations of the earth prostrate, our country finds itself burdened, but still erect, still able from current resources to meet current expense. All these are but the reflection of the genius, not of a select few but of a wonderful people great in intelligence, great in moral power, great in character.

We do not wish to be Greek, we do not wish to be Roman. We have a great desire to be supremely American. That purpose we know we can accomplish by continuing the process which has made us Americans.

We believe in our republic. We believe in the principles of democracy. We believe in liberty. We believe in order under the established provisions of law. We believe in the promotion of literature and the arts. We believe in the righteous authority of organized government. We believe in patriotism. These beliefs must be supported and strengthened. They are not to be inquired of for gain or profit, though without them all gain and all profit would pass away. They will not be found in the teachings devoted exclusively to commercialism, though without them commerce would not exist. These are the higher things of life. Their teaching has come to us from the classics. If they are to be maintained, they will find their support in the institutions of the liberal arts. When we are drawing away from them, we are drawing away from the path of security and progress.

There have been and will be times when the people will be called upon to make great sacrifices for their country. Unless Americans shall continue to live in something more than the present, to be moved by something more than material gains, they will not be able to respond to these requirements and they will go down as

other peoples have gone down before some nation possessed of a greater moral force. The will to endure is not the creation of the moment, it is the result of long training. That will has been our possession up to the present hour. By its exercise we have prospered and brought forth many wonderful works. The object of our education is to continue us in this great power. That power depends upon our ideals.

Those who believe in America, in her language, her arts, her literature, and in her science, will seek to perpetuate them by perpetuating the education which has produced them.

In common with every American, from the President to the office-boy, Mr. Coolidge preaches and believes that America is the greatest nation on earth —greatest in political institutions, greatest in freedom, greatest in manufactures, greatest in commerce, greatest in agriculture, greatest in wealth, greatest in educational facilities, and well on the road to becoming greatest in science, art, and literature. These results, the President says, have been secured by the industry, intelligence, self-sacrifice, and obedience of the American people. But there must be no slackening of effort. "That fervid enterprise, that intellectual ardour . . . known the world over as the American spirit," must flourish with unabated and increasing vigour. Misguided immigrants, who are not prepared to render obedience to American institutions, must be taught their error. Democracy does not mean doing as you like.

More and more emphasis needs to be placed on the duty of obedience. It must be the first lesson of the child in the home, it must be continued without ceasing in the schools, and it must be established and maintained as the predominant principle of good citizenship.

Independence is exceedingly exacting, self-control is arduous,

self-government is difficult. Always there is the temptation that some element of these should be surrendered in exchange for security and ease. The appeal to passion and prejudice always lies in this direction. The proposal to despoil others of their possessions is a manifestation of the same spirit. This is the reason that to certain of our native-born, and more often to our foreign-born, the American Republic proves a disappointment. They thought that self-government meant the absence of all restraint, that independence meant living without work, and that freedom was the privilege of doing what they wanted to do. It has been a hard lesson for them to learn that self-government is still government, that the rule of the people does not mean absence of authority, that independence means self-support, and that complete freedom means complete obedience to law. They are disappointed more than ever when they learn, as ever they do, that these are so, not because they have been decreed by some body of men, but that they are so by the very nature of things, and that all the governments in the world are powerless to change them.

Internationalism has no place in the President's political programme. Unlike Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, and other well-known people, he has no belief in diluted patriotism. He is all for the full-blooded variety.

Our own national existence presupposes the national existence of others. Were there no other countries there would be no choice between countries, and therefore no loyalty to one to the exclusion of others, no patriotism. That virtue we claim for ourselves we must recognize in others. If it be well for America to have a strong national spirit, it must be well for others to cherish the same sentiment. The war did not break this spirit; in any free country it strengthened it, strengthened it for the glory of all. America first is not selfishness; it is the righteous demand for strength to serve. And America has been dedicated to an unselfish service. I weigh my words when I say that both in Europe and in the Orient that service for humanity has not been exceeded by any other nation. It will not be, then, in diminishing but in enlarging the national spirit that true progress for the race will be found.

There can be no society without a home, no civilization without citizenship.

Nations do not come into existence without a purpose. The world soon casts aside organizations which do not minister to its welfare.

In the fullness of time America was called into being under the most favouring circumstances, to work out the problem of a more perfect relationship among mankind that government and society might be brought into harmony with reason and with conscience. The great events and the great men of our country are those that have made the largest contribution to this purpose. The method by which men have always advanced this cause, the only method by which they ever can advance it, is through service and sacrifice. There can be no great people who are not willing to dedicate themselves to this high purpose.

Independence, liberty, civilization—these are not easy to bear; they are hard to bear. It is not sloth and ease but work and achievement which are the ideals of the present day.

These are the main reasons for the formation of patriotic societies. Desiring to promote the highest welfare of civilization, their chief purpose is to preserve and extend American ideals. No matter what others may do, they are determined to serve themselves and their fellow-men by thinking America, believing America, and living America. That faith they are proud to proclaim to all the world.

Other points emphasized by Mr. Coolidge are the maintenance of the existing economic system, subject to certain developments, the importance of scientific discoveries, and the extension of education.

We believe in maintaining modern civilization for the protection and support of free governments, and the development of our economic welfare. We claim they are sound and minister in the best way to human welfare. The great test of an institution is its ability to perpetuate itself. It seems fairly plain that whether or not these institutions can survive with the aid of higher education, without it they have not the slightest chance. We justify the greater and greater accumulations of capital because we believe that therefrom flows the support of all science, art, learning, and

the charities which minister to the humanities of life, all carrying their beneficent effects to the people as a whole. Unless this is immeasurably true our system of civilization ought to stand condemned. It is to be condemned anyway, unless it possesses the ability to perpetuate itself. This can only be true by supporting higher education to such a degree that its good influence may more than match the rising tide of the influence of evil.

In the ideal industry, each individual would become an owner, an operator, and a manager, a master and a servant, a ruler and a subject. Thus there would be established a system of true industrial democracy. In very many industries this is already taking place. Employees are encouraged to purchase stock in the corporation, and are provided with credit facilities for such purpose. This gives them ownership. They are encouraged to make suggestions for the better conduct of the business. They are requested to apply their inventive ability in the various mechanical operations. Through trade unions and shop committees they have a large share in the determination of wages and conditions of labour. By the introduction of the sliding scale and piece-work, they share in the general prosperity of the concern. This gives them management. Thus industrial democracy is being gradually developed.

Neither political nor industrial democracy can relieve mankind from the requirement of obedience.

One of the chief errors of the present day is that of relying too much on the government and too little on our own efforts and on the people themselves. This comes to pass by supposing that, when there is something which ought to be done, we can avoid all personal responsibility by a simple ordinance requiring that hereafter it shall be done by the government. We cannot divest ourselves of our burdens and responsibilities by any such easy method. Where the people themselves are the government, it needs no argument to demonstrate that what the people cannot do their government cannot do.

These and similar speeches made by other speakers are essentially an American product. Even copious extracts do not explain them. They must be read to understand their peculiar qualities in matter and form. They more resemble historical, political,

ethical, economic, and sociological essays than speeches as we understand them. The speakers continually dwell on the past and future glories of America, on her contributions to civilization, on her lofty ideals, and on the necessity for looking after the dollars, while at the same time not forgetting religion and culture. The object of every American is to make America the first nation in the world in political ideas, commerce, finance, eugenics, science, art, and literature—the whole being backed by an efficient navy, army, and air force. From a patriotic standpoint a most admirable ideal, although it may not appeal to those with international sentiments.

Many people may scoff at this American oratory. They may regard it as unduly didactic, bombastic, and full of platitudes. Such criticisms may or may not be justified. The point is that these speeches express a spirit of patriotism and nationalism underlying political differences and asperities. To an American America is a religion. Here it is not the fashion to dilate upon our glorious history and potentialities. It is left to President Coolidge to point out that Britain was made by a sense of obligation and that this characteristic was translated into Nelson's immortal epigram.

All this suggests fundamental questions. Is the British spirit to be maintained? Patriotism and nationalism are the predominant sentiments among nations to-day. Is this country to be an exception? If so, can it hold its own against countries like America, France, and Italy, which are patriotic and

nationalistic to the core? Patriotism and nationality are no doubt indigenous qualities, but teaching can qualify national tendencies. Therefore the further question arises, Are our children to be taught to be Britons or cosmopolitans?

These questions may seem academic considering what Britons did in the war, but we are apt to forget that we are living in a new age when amiable, clever people are preaching new doctrines which require careful investigation in the light of what is happening elsewhere.

I remember attending a dinner at Washington at which the flags of many nations were intermingled under a blaze of electric light. Mr. Balfour in his speech described this as a happy augury, but President Harding in reply said emphatically that America did not wish to see the nations of the world intermingled. She wanted to see them standing side by side in amity, each preserving its identity and individuality. We are faced with another fundamental question. Is it true that our existence depends upon our foreign trade through which we acquire three-fourths of our food and raw materials? Mr. Wheatley says "that the governing factor in industry is not the power to produce but the power to consume," and that the higher the wages the higher will be the consumption. If we depend upon our foreign trade for three-fourths of our food and raw materials, how can we pay for them except by manufactured goods produced at competitive prices? For example, we purchase a large quantity of our

meat and butter from New Zealand, for which we pay by manufactured goods. The New Zealanders consume £16 per head per annum of home products. Will they continue to do this if our prices are raised? And how can British manufacturers compete in the home market against goods produced more cheaply elsewhere? And will not increased cost of production result in increased prices, thus reducing the purchasing power of wages and therefore reducing consumption? These are all vital questions demanding unprejudiced examination.

MYSTERIES OF THE LAW

THE reported speeches delivered at the 1924 powwow between the English and American lawyers were full of good things. Much was said of the glories of the English law, on which American law is founded, but naturally no explanation was provided for the assembled experts of the unique mechanism by which English law has been developed and administered for five hundred years practically without change.

Few laymen understand that the administration of English law owes its purity and excellence to the traditions of those mysterious institutions, the four Inns of Court, and to the training which they provide. Perhaps it never occurs, even to the busy practising barrister, that the comparatively humble work of his daily life, carefully and conscientiously performed in accordance with the stringent code of conduct laid down by the Society to which he belongs, forms the basis of the most perfect legal system the world has yet witnessed. Being faithful over a few things he may be made ruler of many things. The efficiency of the Bench is due to discipline at the Bar.

The Inns of Court, the Inner Temple, the Middle Temple, Lincoln's Inn, and Gray's Inn, were estab-

lished some six hundred years ago as societies for the education of lawyers and as social clubs, and so they still continue. Fortescue (1394–1476) describes them as a

> sort of academy or gymnasium; where they learn singing and all kinds of music, dancing and such other accomplishments and diversions, which are called revels, as are suitable to their quality, and such as are usually practised at Court. At other times, out of term, the greater part apply themselves to the study of the law. Upon festival days, and after the offices of the Church are over, they employ themselves in the study of sacred and profane history. Here everything which is good and virtuous is to be learned, all vice is discouraged and banished. So that Knights, Barons, and the greatest nobility of the Kingdom, often place their children in those Inns of Court; not so much to make the laws their study, much less to live by the profession, having large patrimonies of their own, but to form their manners and to preserve them from the contagion of vice. The discipline is so excellent, that there is scarce ever known to be any piques or differences, any differings or disturbances amongst them. The only way they have of punishing delinquents is by expelling them from the society, which punishment they dread more than criminals do imprisonment and irons; for he who is expelled out of one society is never taken in by any other. Whence it happens that there is a constant harmony among them, the greatest friendship, and a general freedom of conversation. The manner and method how the laws are professed and studied in those places is pleasant and excellently well adapted for proficiency.

It cannot be said that, speaking strictly, this is an accurate description of the Inns of Court as they are to-day. They still have a strong social side, evidenced by daily luncheons and dinners, much conversation, and occasional balls and other festivities. But in these times the educational and professional sides predominate. Each Inn comprises a spacious hall and offices, a great library, numerous chambers for

the use of the members, beautiful gardens, and a church, but the Inner and Middle Temples share the same historic place of worship. The Inns still occupy their original homes. The Societies of the Inner and Middle Temples are housed in the alluring district bounded on the one side by Fleet Street and the Strand and on the other by the Thames Embankment. The Inner Temple occupies the site of the abode of the Knights Templars built about the year 1240, and the Middle Temple possesses one of the most stately of existing Elizabethan buildings. Lincoln's Inn lies between Chancery Lane and Lincoln's Inn Fields, standing on the site formerly occupied by the Manor House of the Earls of Lincoln, and Gray's Inn is situated on the north side of High Holborn, on land acquired long ago from Baron Grey de Wilton.

The members of the Inns have the exclusive right to act as advocates in the superior Courts of Justice, and Judges can only be drawn from their ranks. Persons wishing to become barristers must enter themselves at one of the Inns. After paying the necessary fees, being trained, passing certain examinations, and eating so many dinners in the Inn, the student is "called to the Bar," this being a metonym [1]

[1] A word designating one thing by the name of another connected with it. Bain's "Rhetoric and Composition" (Longmans, 1890), Part I., Intellectual Elements of Style, p. 186, contains an attractive disquisition on the metonym; synecdoche (naming a thing by referring to a part of it, *e.g.*, "A maiden of sixteen *summers*"); the transferred epithet (the shifting of an adjective from one thing to another connected with it, *e.g.*, "the restless pillow"

signifying the barristers who stand at the Bar of the Law Courts ready to plead for their clients, should they be lucky enough to have any. In these unregenerate days there is no Bar. The King's Counsel, leaders, or "silks," as they are called, sit on the front row of seats, and the Juniors, or stuff-gownsmen, behind them. Between the two there is supposed to be a Bar. A King's Counsel, by the way, is appointed by the Lord Chancellor on behalf of the Crown. He commands higher fees, and cannot appear in certain cases without the assistance of a Junior, nor can he appear in a criminal case without the sanction of the Crown, which has the first call on his services. Here it may be observed that every barrister has a clerk, who is paid by the client a specified commission on the fees received by his principal. These are not recoverable at law, nor can a client sue a counsel for negligence, the fiction being that the barrister's services are voluntary. No action for slander lies against a barrister for what he says in the conduct of a case.

The Bar is the oldest and most powerful trade union. Attention has already been directed to its strict code of honour. As in other classes, now and again black sheep appear, but they are not allowed to stray far. In addition, like other trade unions, it is governed by various rules, framed for the benefit of its members or the protection of clients. The question is often asked how a barrister can justly defend a person whom

is an expression describing the restlessness of the person lying on it; or, "a lackey presented an *obsequious* cup of coffee").

he knows to be guilty. The answer is that a counsel never defends a prisoner who has confessed his guilt, except to plead in mitigation of the sentence. To do so would be a breach of professional etiquette. But short of this the counsel does his best for his client, however black the facts may appear. For some unexplained reason the public do not take the same interest in the Bar, and particularly in the leading counsel, as they did. In former times, prominent barristers were public heroes. To-day they receive comparatively little attention—perhaps because there are so many more heroes of other kinds. It must be confessed, however, that the Bar has never been understood by the laity. They do not appreciate its spirit of adventure, or the *camaraderie* by which its members are united. The bond of brotherhood is stronger amongst members of the Bar than in any other trade, profession, or business. Only some 3,000 or 4,000 of the 10,000 barristers on the roll practise; but once a barrister, always a barrister. No class is more jealous of its rights and privileges, and none more insistent on maintaining them. Generally speaking, the public greatly benefit by this corporate feeling which produces a type of mind and public servant commanding world-wide admiration and respect.

Those who desire more detailed information regarding these ancient societies should read "The Story of Our Inns of Court," by that distinguished lawyer, the Right Hon. Sir D. Plunket Barton, Bart., and Messrs. Benham and Watt (Foulis and Co., price 10*s.* 6*d.*). It is a fascinating book.

In the first half of the nineteenth century, a fierce battle raged over the administration of the law, criminal and civil. Both branches were disfigured by serious blemishes. The criminal law was harsh and inhuman, ferocious penalties being inflicted for comparatively slight offences. The oft-quoted case of Mary Jones was typical. The facts were related by Sir William Meredith in a Parliamentary speech, of which an extract is given in the preface to "Barnaby Rudge":

"Under the Shop-lifting Act one Mary Jones was executed; it was at the time when press warrants were issued, on the alarm about the Falkland Islands. The woman's husband was pressed, their goods seized for some debts of his, and she, with two small children, turned into the streets a-begging. It is a circumstance not to be forgotten, that she was very young (under nineteen), and most remarkably handsome. She went to a linen-draper's shop, took some coarse linen off the counter, and slipped it under her cloak; the shopman saw her and she laid it down: for this she was hanged. Her defence was 'that she had lived in credit, and wanted for nothing, till a pressgang came and stole her husband from her; but since then she had no bed to lie on; nothing to give her children to eat; and they were almost naked; and perhaps she might have done something wrong, for she hardly knew what she did.' The parish officers testified the truth of this story; but it seems, there had been a good deal of shop-lifting about Ludgate; an example was thought necessary; and this woman was hanged for the comfort and satisfaction of shopkeepers in Ludgate Street. When brought to receive sentence she behaved in such a frantic manner as proved her mind to be in a distracted and desponding state; and the child was suckling at her breast when she set out for Tyburn."

The judges were not responsible for this unhappy state of affairs. They had to administer the law as it had been handed down to them, and it was by

the efforts of humane and public-spirited lawyers, like Sir Samuel Romilly and Bentham, that the severity of the law was mitigated in 1834 by substituting deportation overseas for death, except in murder cases. Deportation was abolished in 1857, and subsequent reforms have so improved matters that to-day proposed changes in the law mostly relate to creating new offences or to increasing the penalties for certain of those which exist already. The rules of evidence were another source of injustice, as the prisoner was often precluded from stating his case. On the other hand, the highly technical nature of the proceedings frequently enabled the guilty to escape. By a succession of reforms, these evils have now been remedied. Until 1873 proceedings on the civil side, especially in Chancery, were complicated, dilatory, and expensive.

Unhappily, although many glaring abuses have been removed, litigation is perhaps more expensive than ever, trials often last for an inordinate time, and the fees of fashionable counsel are on a scale undreamt of even thirty years ago. Nowadays a contested case is the luxury of the rich or the refuge of despair. It usually spells ruin to the average citizen. See the recent Russell case, for example. The public are, however, apathetic. An occasional outburst from Lord Buckmaster or some horrified judge provides an interesting Press paragraph, and there the matter ends. The judges would no doubt like to limit the length of trials, but they have their difficulties. They may be charged with impatience

or upset on appeal for excluding what should have been allowed. If the judges were supported by public opinion, conditions would soon improve, and if litigants are bent on having certain counsel, they must be prepared to pay for the luxury. Those who complain that they do not receive the exclusive attention of counsel briefed at great expense may blame themselves for not insisting on this beforehand, or comfort themselves with the reflection that, as yet, no barrister, however ubiquitous, can be in several courts at the same time. Perhaps wireless will solve the problem!

LOOKING THE PART

Looking the part is a great asset. Kings, queens, statesmen, bishops, lawyers, doctors, musicians, butlers, etc., who look the part create the appropriate atmosphere. Who could enjoy a bishop's blessing if he looked like a jockey? It is not strange that most great people look the part. They look what they are.

Leo XIII was a notable example—with his wonderful eyes, thin face, ivory complexion, peaceful smile, slim figure, and almost transparent hands. If you had met him without his vestments, you would have felt that he was, or should have been, Pope. Even Zola was impressed by his dignity and "superb eyes, brilliant like black diamonds, endowed with sufficient penetration and strength to lay souls open and force them to confess the truth aloud," and his strong, full voice, the sort "people are surprised to hear coming from apparently bloodless and breathless frames." (Rome: Chatto & Windus.)

Mr. Gladstone was another instance. He looked a great person. He had all the gifts—a commanding figure, striking features, brilliant eyes, and a voice that thrilled great audiences and made them tremble with emotion.

Modern voices seem to lack this mysterious quality. I have been told by people who had heard Mario, the tenor (1810–83), that when, unseen by the audience, he sang "Donna è Mobile," a tremor went through the whole house. To go farther back, evidently Queen Elizabeth, Oliver Cromwell, and King Charles II. looked their parts. The Queen, clever, energetic, determined, and shrewish; Cromwell, stern and dour; and the King, cynical and pleasure-loving. Robespierre looked what he was, a fanatical pedant, and Earl Chatham's physical appearance corresponded with his volcanic energy and stately diction. Queen Victoria looked what she was, imperious, firm, and dignified, and King Edward's character was reflected in his stately, urbane demeanour. When thinking of these great people of bygone days, I thought I should like to repeat a youthful experience by paying another visit to Madame Tussaud's.

The visit resembled re-reading "Robinson Crusoe" when you are grown up. You discover things you did not perceive in your youth. Robinson Crusoe was a philosopher and theological critic. This you did not notice when you were young. So it is with Madame Tussaud's. As a child you were awed by the weird collection of inanimate figures, which you suspected preserved some semblance of life—the impression being intensified by the beautiful lady whose bosom rose and fell so gracefully as she slumbered. She seems to breathe more softly than she did in my young days. Perhaps, like the rest of

us, she is getting old. As a grown-up at first you are amused by these serious-looking waxen men and women—some rather grotesque—but on reflection they present interesting problems. It dawns on you that we live in a smiling age, when kings, queens, and politicians have copied the smiling habit from actresses—Ellaline Terriss, Marie Studholme, and their successors—the first to discover how to captivate a world eager for rays of sunshine. To-day the whole world is posing for the photographer. Nowadays all public characters, including even alleged murderers, try to make good pictures.

Our ancestors were very serious people who looked the part. Perhaps they possessed more humour than the present generation, but on the whole they were a stern race. Queen Elizabeth, Queen Victoria, Oliver Cromwell, Pitt, Peel, Palmerston, Gladstone, Disraeli, and even King Edward, were not of the smiling variety. The same remark applies to great inventors—Watt, Arkwright, etc.; great scientists such as Faraday and Darwin; and great explorers, Captain Cook, Livingstone, etc. They looked what they were. So did the merchants. Building up British foreign trade was a stupendous task. The generations who have reaped the fruits of the enterprise and industry of these remarkable people can hardly realize what their ancestors had to cope with. No wonder they looked serious. I am all for smiles, but as I wandered past these rows of waxen ghosts I wondered whether the smiling age, with all its implications, will hold what the more serious ages

created. Shall we retain our foreign trade on which our existence depends, in competition with nations who have not got such broad smiles? Time alone will show.

No doubt trappings help people to look the part. Mankind has not yet reached the stage when it is free from such influences. For instance, judges without their wigs and robes are not nearly so impressive. Even the death sentence would be robbed of much of its solemnity by the absence of the black cap.

It will be remembered that the courtiers in Longfellow's "King Robert of Sicily" accepted the Angel as the King largely because he appeared in the royal insignia to which they were accustomed. To King Robert's astonishment,

> There, on the dais, sat another King,
> Wearing his robes, his crown, his signet-ring,

while the real King Robert, when

> Dressed in the motley garb that Jesters wear,

was treated accordingly.

But angels are not the only people who masquerade. Many wear clothes which do not represent their honest convictions. For instance, as the Prime Minister pointed out the other day, the wearing of a tattered hat and red tie does not necessarily imply genuine Socialistic opinions.

Looking the part has its dangers. Many people look what they are not, which is perhaps worse than not looking what they are. There are many frauds

who look the part but do not deliver the goods. They are asses in lions' skins, or sometimes, worse still, wolves in sheep's clothing. The fate of the good Abbot of Birchington in the "Ingoldsby Legends" should serve as a warning of the danger of looking what you are not. The Abbot resembled his ne'er-do-well brother:

> He was tall and upright, About six feet in height,
> His complexion was what you'd denominate light,
> And the tonsure had left, 'mid his ringlets of brown,
> A little bald patch on the top of his crown.
>
> His bright sparkling eye Was of hazel, and nigh
> Rose a finely-arch'd eyebrow of similar dye;
> He'd a small, well-form'd mouth with the Cupidon lip,
> And an aquiline nose, somewhat red at the tip.

The naughty brother had the same characteristics, for

> Though he had not shorn his ringlets of brown,
> He'd a little bald patch on the top of his crown.

Unhappily, the Devil's agents, sent to seize the evil-liver and being supplied only with a police description, removed the Abbot "to another place," to use Parliamentary language. Much negotiation was necessary to secure his release.

The modern practice of labelling guests at great receptions might perhaps be extended with advantage. But then there is always the danger of changing the labels. Many will remember Owen Wister's story in "The Virginian" of the cowboy, who in a mad fit changed the shawls in which dozens of babies were wrapped while their mothers were dancing. The mistake was only discovered after the company had

dispersed for miles in various directions. The infants were detected by their cries, which shows that Jacob's voice triumphs in the long run. In the final issue the question is not what you look, but who and what you are.

The emblematical side of clothes must be a fascinating study. I have never had time to pursue it. Why do kings wear crowns? Why do lawyers wear gowns and wigs? It is, of course, easy to understand the emblematical little bags still worn on lawyers' gowns into which in bygone days the clients slipped their fees. The bags show that fees are still expected. That dry book Carlyle's "Sartor Resartus" or "The Philosophy of Clothes" never appealed to me. It is too enigmatical. Nevertheless, it has its points. Our mental and incorporeal clothes are more important than our corporeal garments. We are all clothed in good or bad habits, in nationality or in the membership of our class. Some are clothed in authority, some in kindliness, and some in selfishness. Needless to say, it is easier to change the shape of our coats and dresses than to alter our habits and opinions, or to divest ourselves of the mesh of life which has made us what we are.

THE SCOTTISH IDOL

Dr. Johnson described Shakespeare as "the poet of Nature." By this he meant that Shakespeare wrote of eternal things, which find a mirror in every mind and a response in every bosom. Love, courage, remorse, freedom, patriotism, hypocrisy, and the rest. The same may be said of Burns. That is why, unaffected by changes of fashion, he is more read, more quoted, and more sung than at any previous time. That is why he alone among all poets calls forth perennial streams of affection. That is why Burns Societies and statues of the poet are found in all parts of the world. In glowing language of rapture and fire he expressed the feelings of the ordinary man, unswayed by literary prejudices. His power is shown not only by the splendour of particular passages, but by the spirit that shines forth in every page; the spirit that enables the reader to visualize and link Burns to his soul as a living personality.

He breathed poetry into the daily lives of his fellow-countrymen. When we hear the cry of the curlew on the Ayrshire hills, or listen to the song of the mavis as the evening shadows fall, or wander beneath the "silver gleaming ray" of the moon "and spark-

ling stars of night," it is the spirit of Burns that whispers what we feel and wish to say :

> " For now he haunts his native land
> As an immortal youth ; his hand
> Guides every plough,
> He sits beside each ingle-nook ;
> His voice is in each rushing brook,
> Each rustling bough."

Something stirs in us that he puts into words. He it is who makes us stop in the wood to listen to that mavis singing. He loves the little people who dwell close to the ground or wing their flight in the air, the " wee timorous beastie "—" the little linnet on her nest." And he makes us love them, too. He it is who provides the universal currency of friendship in " Auld Lang Syne."

The gift of imparting emotion to the written or printed word is one of Nature's mysteries. Burns had it in the highest degree. Sir Walter Scott said that the poet's eyes " literally glowed when he spoke with feeling or interest." It was this glowing quality deep down in his heart that made Burns write as he did. He was never guilty of the worst of all faults —tediousness. Sir Walter Scott describes him as looking shrewd and sensible. These qualities he imparted to many of his poems. Indeed, he is the moralist and philosopher who has furnished the Scottish people with their favourite maxims :

> " I'll no say, men are villains a' ;
> The real, harden'd wicked,
> Wha hae nae check but human law,
> Are to a few restricket ;

But och! mankind are unco weak,
An' little to be trusted;
If *self* the wavering balance shake,
It's rarely right adjusted!

Ay free, aff han', your story tell,
When wi' a bosom crony;
But still keep something to yoursel'
Ye scarcely tell to ony;
Conceal yoursel' as weel's ye can
Frae critical dissection;
But keek thro' ev'ry other man,
Wi' sharpen'd, sly inspection."

"What's done we partly may compute,
But know not what's resisted."

It is an interesting problem why certain lilts and cadences specially appeal to the unsophisticated. It is also interesting to compare the favourite lines of highly educated persons with popular favourites. For instance, Mr. Gladstone thought Wordsworth's line,

"Or hear old Triton blow his wreathèd horn,"

"one of the finest in all poetry." Tennyson described Wordsworth's

"Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns"

as "almost the grandest thing in the English language." Lord Morley considered "the most melting and melodious single verse" Shakespeare's

"After life's fitful fever he sleeps well";

while Mr. Lytton Strachey mentions with approval Wordsworth's

"The silence that is in the starry sky,
The sleep that is among the lonely hills."

These beautiful lines are too frigid and aloof to be

popular. They lack the human touch that made Burns the Scottish idol; simple thoughts expressed in simple words, strung together in musical cadence:

"Beneath the milk-white thorn that scents the evening gale."

"O pale, pale now those rosy lips
I aft hae kiss'd sae fondly."

"The small birds rejoice in the green leaves returning . . .
And wild scatter'd cowslips bedeck the green dale."

Dryden said of Shakespeare: "Those who accuse him to have wanted learning give him the greater commendation; he was naturally learned; he needed not the spectacles of books to read Nature; he looked inwards and found her there." So it was with Burns. "His genius was not to be depressed by the weight of poverty; the incumbrances of his fortune were shaken from his mind as dewdrops from a lion's mane."

LORD HALDANE

A Political Admirable Crichton

By an amazing turn of Fortune's wheel, Lord Haldane again became Lord Chancellor in 1924. Statesman, philosopher, lawyer, and scientist, he is certainly one of the most striking figures in the Cabinet. Let us take a bird's-eye view of this remarkable man. Needless to say, he is a Scot, the son of a Writer to the Signet (a Scottish solicitor with special privileges). As a student at Edinburgh and Göttingen Universities, he was a brilliant success. Education was a religion in the Haldane family. It seems to have been justified by results. One of Lord Haldane's brothers is a distinguished professor and a Fellow of the Royal Society. Another is Crown Agent (Public Prosecutor) for Scotland, and his sister is a lady of much learning and many attainments.

In 1879, at the early age of twenty-three, Lord Haldane was called to the English Bar. He took to the Chancery Courts and performed a miracle by becoming a Q.C. (this was in Queen Victoria's glorious days) when only thirty-four. For the next fifteen years he had a large and lucrative practice. In 1885 he entered Parliament, and twenty years later became Secretary for War, a position he held for seven years.

He reorganized the Army, established the Officers' Training Corps, and rendered invaluable service on the Committee of Imperial Defence. In 1912 he was appointed Lord Chancellor. Then came the war, in which, owing to his experience at the War Office, he seemed destined to play a leading part. But it was not to be. Being suspected of German tendencies, he was subjected to violent attacks and misrepresentations, which led Mr. Asquith to supersede him on the formation of the first Coalition Government in 1915. All who knew the facts were aware that these suspicions were unfounded. His conduct during the Agadir Crisis, when he strongly supported the French, and against the wishes of at least one of his colleagues insisted upon the necessity for an expeditionary force, should have been sufficient guarantee. However, Lord Haldane's ill-informed critics prevailed, and Mr. Asquith jettisoned his Lord Chancellor to appease the sharks.

It must be confessed that the victim's public utterances had laid him open to criticism in a time of national excitement. The inflamed and untutored mind could not discriminate between affection for German philosophy and affection for Germans. Point was given to the attack by his visit to the German Emperor in 1912. The public did not know that he had gone at the request of the Cabinet to obtain information and negotiate concerning the new German naval programme. However, the sharks got him. Had he been allowed to remain at the War Office, where, during the first few days of the war,

he deputized for Mr. Asquith, then Chief Secretary, the progress of the struggle might have been different. Organization and attention to detail are his strong points. With Lord Kitchener as Commander-in-Chief, we should have had a wonderful combination. He early saw the necessity for improved explosives, and advised the employment of Lord Moulton, who did such great things. Had Lord Haldane been left at the War Office, the shell shortage, which led to the formation of the Ministry of Munitions, would probably have been avoided.

During the war, and for some time afterwards, he had a poor time, but bore his troubles with patience, dignity, and geniality. They, however, left their mark on him. Even his strong constitution and fund of optimism could not bring him unscathed through such an ordeal. He was not without sympathizers. When Mr. Asquith decided to replace him, a large number of members of Parliament made a written protest.

He is a philosopher and metaphysician. At the age of twenty he won the Prize for Philosophy, awarded by the four Scottish Universities, and is author of several notable books on the subject. He is also a scientist—a Fellow of the Royal Society—much interested in the development of electricity for industrial purposes. In a modified sense he believes in the basic doctrine of present-day Socialists—viz., that industry and commerce are badly equipped and inefficiently managed, and that poverty and distress may be relieved by better industrial and

commercial methods. Like his father and mother, he is also an enthusiastic educationist, believing that the future of mankind depends on better training. On his downfall in 1915 he gave increased attention to philosophy, education, and science. No doubt these diversions enabled him to bear a burden which would have crushed most people. During recent years he has become a disciple of Einstein and has written two books on relativity. Lord Haldane is a practical idealist. While all for peace and peace measures, he recognizes that

> . . . mankind are unco weak,
> An' little to be trusted.

He knows that unless Britain is prepared to defend herself she may be starved and ruined in a very short time.

Therefore we may hope for the best. While Lord Haldane is a member of the Committee of Imperial Defence we are not likely to be left to the protection of words, although if words were the equivalent of ships and aeroplanes he could furnish an ample supply, for he is a voluble speaker. Indeed, this is his chief defect. His active, well-filled, and well-ordered mind furnishes too much oratorical provender. His enthusiasm leads him to explain every detail, with the result that the audience are sometimes overwhelmed. He forgets that the assimilative powers of his weaker brethren are more limited than his own. As the ancients used to say, " The half is sometimes better than the whole." This power of words, however, is a Parliamentary asset. Consciously or unconsciously,

Lord Haldane invented what I call the oil-and-feather method. Most great Parliamentarians make brilliant sallies in debate, but, like Prince Rupert, often end up by losing their artillery. Not so Lord Haldane. He never attempts brilliancy in Parliament. He gently sprays his adversaries for hours at a time with feathers and oil—feathers in the shape of facts and arguments, and oil in the shape of compliments and pious aspirations for the success of his scheme. When he concludes, most of his opponents, who entered the House breathing fire and slaughter, stagger out gasping for air. The few survivors make a feeble protest. Lord Haldane turns on the spray again and eventually walks off victorious with his Bill in his pocket as drafted.

Of course, this method is only possible for those who are sincere and earnest. Lord Haldane never advocates anything he does not believe. Whether he adopted this oratorical plan by design, it is impossible to say. Although the most honest of men, he is not without guile and possesses a pawky sense of humour. When all is said, oil and feathers are quite legitimate. The object of Parliamentary oratory is to quell your opponents. If you can accomplish this by an earnest four hours' speech, why not? The ribald, however, ascribe the length of Lord Haldane's speeches to the philosophical theory, to which he is said to adhere, that the universe is timeless and trackless.

As may be imagined, this many-sided man is a complex character. Kindness and courtesy are two

of his chief attributes. He never says bitter things and is noted for his constant attention to sick friends and acquaintances. He is devoted to his aged mother, now one hundred years old, and still in possession of her faculties—a truly wonderful woman. His industry is phenomenal. Technical subjects have no terrors for him. He has the gift of seizing essentials, imagination to construct a plan of action, and energy and pertinacity to make it a success. In short, he possesses a busy, practical, constructive mind, which is a national asset. He remarked some years ago: "The noblest of souls can find full satisfaction for his best aspirations in the sustained effort to do his duty in the work that lies at hand, to the utmost that is in him." Lord Haldane lives up to this aphorism, always working, always trying to accomplish something and to do it as well as he can. Although so practical, Lord Haldane is a mystic—an unusual combination. During recent years his interest in philosophy has become more intense.

He looks what he is—a mixture of the professor, lawyer, and benevolent, sagacious, good-natured Scottish gentleman. Of middle height, he is well and sturdily built, but nowadays has a habit of stooping and walking with his hands behind his back, which makes him look older than he is. He has a fine head, and generous, kindly eyes. His pallid complexion is no indication of a delicate constitution. On the contrary, until recently he never knew what illness was, and is said to have thought

nothing of walking from London to Oxford. Indeed, he is still a member of a walking club.

It may be asked why a man so gifted should be so little understood and appreciated. Perhaps it is because he is too much like a genial professor—always anxious to teach and improve. This raises the question, do mankind properly appreciate the efficient and well-informed who wish to improve them? Very doubtful.

DRINK: POISON OR PANACEA?

Drink has long been a controversial subject. Teetotallers regard those who do not agree with them as selfish, contumacious, and unpatriotic, while moderate drinkers resent reflections upon their conduct and attempted interference with their personal habits. This resentment is emphasized by the superior moral standard claimed, or supposed to be claimed, by the teetotal fraternity. And so issue is joined with plenty of heat and vituperation. Recently the fray has been exacerbated by the advocacy of compulsion on American lines, but it is right to say that this development is not supported by all sections of the teetotal movement. My experience is exceptional and amusing. Teetotallers cannot improve a lifelong abstainer of the rigid type; while having no prejudices and holding strong views concerning personal liberty, I have no wish to interfere with moderate drinkers. Therefore I can be on friendly terms with both sides and attend temperance breakfasts and licensed victuallers' banquets with impartiality.

Literature on the drink question is proverbially partisan. An author usually sets out to prove one case or the other, and his views are often tinctured by personal prejudice or predilection. Therefore a

judicial work on the subject is a welcome relief. Dr. Shadwell, who has long been known as an able investigator of social problems, and who for many years has devoted special attention to the drink question, has provided one. ("Drink, 1914–1922." Longmans, price 10*s.* 6*d.*) The earlier parts, comprising a detailed history of the trade during the period mentioned, I found informative but dull. Digging up old bones of this sort is not inspiring. Nevertheless, the record is useful, and revives interesting memories, including the proposal that the State should acquire the drink trade. What a tangle we should have been in, and what a task the Minister of Drink would have had as manager of thousands of public-houses and employer of swarms of barmaids! The record also forms the basis of the illuminating chapter in which the writer states his conclusions.

As we know, during the war the hours for the sale of drink were shortened, the prices increased, and the strength reduced. The result was improved sobriety and efficiency. Convictions for drunkenness fell from 146,000 in 1914 to 22,000 in 1918. In 1922 the figure was 63,000. Dr. Shadwell, however, fails to point out that too much importance must not be attached to these statistics. Arrests and convictions for drunkenness depend in great measure upon the action of the police and magistrates in different districts. If lenient views prevail, either the offender is not arrested, or if arrested is given the benefit of the doubt. The contrary practice produces a crop of arrests and convictions. It must also be borne in

mind that during the war period not only was the sale of drink restricted, but several million men were absent.

But apart from these figures there is ample evidence of the effect of the restrictions. This will be seen from the following table, and it must be remembered that the population increased about two millions between 1914 and 1922:

Year.	Production of Beer. Barrels.	Production of Spirits. Gallons.
1914	35,000,000	51,000,000
1919	13,000,000	27,000,000
1922	23,000,000	36,000,000

To this may be added the surprising facts that the revenue from drink in 1922 was about £190,000,000, as compared with some £33,000,000 in 1910, and that we raise nearly one-fourth of our total revenue by this means.

Dr. Shadwell's first point is to draw attention to the importance of drink as an element in national life. Sobriety has been growing, but he considers that the habit of excessive drinking still prevails to such an extent as to constitute a serious national disability. Most of us will agree with him. The evil is not confined to any one class. There are intemperate people in all classes. His second point is that excessive drinking can be checked by appropriate measures which leave an amount of liberty sufficient to avoid widespread revolt against the law or whole-

sale evasion. The measures on which he relies are high taxation and limited hours of sale. Thirdly, he considers that State ownership (as at Carlisle), the reduction of licensed houses, alteration of premises, disinterested management, and supply of food in public-houses have failed to exert any perceptible influence on sobriety. His last conclusion is that the people will only stand a certain degree of control, and that if the string is pulled too tight they will rebel, as they have done on two occasions since 1914. Therefore he is strongly opposed to prohibition. His remedies are resolute retention of existing restrictions and raising the status of the public-house from a drinking bar to a place of refreshment. He says that improved public-houses may not diminish the consumption of drink by the present generation, but a new atmosphere will be created that will have a beneficial effect upon succeeding ones. These are sane ideas. Dr. Shadwell does not in terms suggest, but implies, that the most important measure is to teach the young the advantages of temperance. With this every one will agree.

I now pass to another recent book by Professor Starling, F.R.S., the physiologist, "The Action of Alcohol on Man" (Longmans, price 12*s.* 6*d.*), which comprises incidentally the most lucid account I have read of the processes of digestion, so graphic that those who take alcoholic drink will in imagination be able to follow its peregrinations as it wanders round the metropolis and suburbs of the human frame. Whether this will increase or mar their enjoyment it

is difficult to say. Personally, I should think it might be an incentive to teetotalism. Professor Starling also gives a fascinating description of the manufacture of fermented liquors, fascinating even to a teetotaller. Alcohol as a food, and its effects on fatigue and digestion, are discussed at length, together with other cognate subjects. The Professor's conclusions may be briefly stated. Alcohol is a food, and indirectly an aid to digestion, but, generally speaking, prejudicial to physical and mental effort; nor does it allay fatigue. Its use in moderation (the standard varying in the case of each individual) is, however, beneficial, as at once an anodyne and exhilarator.

To use the Professor's words:

It is part of the comfort devised by civilized man for the promotion of repose and repair after the day's work. . . .

Conviviality is more important for the maintenance of our mental stability and effectiveness than we realize. . . .

He has obtained not only greater enjoyment of his meal, resulting in increase of appetite and consequent improvement in the processes of digestion, but the greater enjoyment is due itself to the fact that this small dose has given him repose of spirit from the endless little worries of the day's work. He has sat down to dinner, fighting in his own mind the battles of the day over again, preparing for the work of the future, and seeking methods of warding off possible dangers to himself or to his plans. But for the moment these thoughts and cares are no longer of any value to him in his life's work: the time has come for repose and repair; and for complete digestion and assimilation he needs to free his mind of them. Under the influence of alcohol past troubles cease to repeat themselves and to reverberate in his mind. The worries of the day fall off like a garment, and he acquires a restful and contented frame of mind, in which he takes a more sanguine view of the present and of the future, and leaves difficulties and dangers till the morrow, when he will be prepared to deal with them refreshed and restored by the night's sleep.

Professor Starling's general conclusion is summed up in his preface: "In a civilized society such as ours the abolition of all alcoholic beverages from among our midst, even if carried out by universal consent, would be a mistake and contrary to the permanent interest of the race. If it were enforced by legislation against the wishes and convictions of a large proportion of the members of the community, I believe it would be little short of a calamity."

Needless to say, Professor Starling has caused a profound sensation in temperance circles, and his conclusions are not shared by many eminent medical men. An unbiased examination of the arguments seems to show that the chief objections to the use of alcohol lie in the danger of excess, which the Professor does not minimize. The qualities that make it useful from his point of view make it seductive and dangerous. He believes, however, that "we may hope in time, by education, by instillation of proper ideals, and by providing such conditions of life as are compatible with self-respect, drunkenness, with all its attendant and consequent evils, may be entirely abolished."

Although teetotalism suits me, having been accustomed to it all my life, and although fully alive to the evils and dangers of drink, I must admit there is something to be said for Professor Starling's argument.

Teetotallers have done wonderful work in face of much contumely. What we owe to them it is difficult to realize. There is still great need for reform, but no one can deny the change in national habits and

point of view. Admitting all this, it is questionable whether the total disuse of drink would be an unqualified advantage. We continually dwell on its evils, but little is said of the millions of moderate drinkers who believe they are happier and better in consequence. Whether this is an illusion it is not for me to say. If it is, let us remember that life is made up of illusions. One thing is certain. A teetotal world would be a very critical one. Would this make for increased happiness? I wonder!

THE NEW SLAVERY

THE temperance question is assuming a new and interesting phase. I do not refer to the operations of the American " highjackers "—modern pirates who prey upon the bootleggers (see " Prohibition Inside Out," T. Fisher Unwin, price 10*s.* 6*d.*)—but to an announcement by the amiable Mr. Ford of his intention to enforce prohibition by discharging any workman in his employ who has " the odour of beer, wine, or liquor in his breath, or who has any of these intoxicants on his person or in his home." Let us hope that in furtherance of this patriotic campaign Mr. Ford, with his accustomed ingenuity, will add to our obligations by inventing a machine for detecting the alcoholic odour. The workmen can then be required to " breathe in " as well as to " clock in." The idea opens up vast possibilities. Regulations might be made prohibiting the sale of liquor to persons whose breath registered more than a certain percentage of alcohol. Introduced into the home, however, the liquor detector might cause serious trouble. But, whatever happens, Mr. Ford, the world's champion free advertiser, has secured another " boost." With tears I admit my share in providing it !

There are other aspects of the movement demanding careful reflection. As De Quincey said long ago, it is the most remarkable combined movement in history—not confined to any one nation, class, or religion. Therefore a world survey is required. To begin with, it is interesting to note that the movement started in America in 1808. Its first phase was abstention from spirits, followed in 1826 by the formation of a total abstinence association. The movement soon spread to the United Kingdom, Ireland, Scandinavia, Holland, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. In this country the first total abstinence society was formed at Preston in 1832. It had been preceded by others having for their object abstention from spirits. The term " teetotaller " was coined in 1833 by a working-man speaker, one Richard Turner, who immortalized himself by declaring that he would " be right down out and out *t*-total for ever and ever." According to Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Turner did not stutter, but duplicated the " t " in " total " for emphasis. Anyway, " teetotal " became and still remains the temperance slogan.

Like all great movements, the temperance movement was a necessity arising out of the exigencies of the time. Excessive drinking was a crying social evil, affecting every class of the community. To abstain from intoxicants was regarded as a social crime. Everybody drank freely, from Prime Ministers to scullery-maids. Drunken men and women were common objects in the streets, and fashionable

dinner-parties were frequently drunken orgies. All social life centred round the bottle or beer-barrel, and drink was a necessary ingredient in most business transactions.

An examination of Dickens's novels will afford a good idea of the drinking customs of the first half of the last century. The jovial Mr. Pickwick frequently got more or less drunk twice daily. No one thought any the worse of him. Such proceedings were regarded as evidence of a genial and benevolent disposition. Indeed, the whole community floated along on an ocean of liquor, strewn with human wreckage. Nowadays, conditions are not ideal, but they are very different from what they were. The point of view has changed. The world has adopted the temperance idea. No one defends excessive drinking and the total abstainer is no longer a social outcast. This improvement is mainly due to the temperance movement, although other agencies have contributed, notably the spread of hygienic principles, athletics, games, and other healthy forms of recreation. It must, however, be confessed that, notwithstanding the success of the movement in imposing its opinions upon the community, temperance advocates have never been popular. When I was younger there was a well-known hymn :

> Dare to be a Daniel,
> Dare to stand alone,
> Dare to have a purpose firm,
> Dare to make it known !

The truth is that the bibulous lions have donned the

clothes of the teetotal Daniels without due acknowledgment. On the other hand, improved conditions have robbed the temperance party of much of its zeal and fervour, and diverted its efforts from moral suasion to attempts at legislative control. In America, Canada, Norway, and elsewhere these efforts have been successful, but results have not fulfilled the party's expectations. To modify the old adage, it is easier to tell a horse not to drink than to keep him from drinking.

There is, however, some misconception regarding prohibition in America. It is inaccurate, as often alleged, that the law was hastily passed. The famous 18th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States necessary to enable the Legislature to enact national prohibition was passed in 1917 by large majorities both in the Senate and Congress. It required ratification by three-fourths of the State Legislature within seven years. Within fourteen months forty-five of the forty-eight States, with a population of over 100,000,000, had formally approved, the resolutions being carried in most cases by large majorities. Three States, with a population of some 6,000,000, refused to ratify. The Amendment having been ratified, the National Prohibition Act was passed by large majorities in 1919, notwithstanding President Wilson's veto. These proceedings occupied more than two years. Full details will be found in Sir Arthur Newsholme's "Prohibition in America" (P. S. King & Son, price 2*s.*). No compensation was granted to the trade.

It is difficult to elucidate the facts regarding the working of prohibition in America, and much difference of opinion exists between Americans themselves on the subject. Some describe the law as a farce and a fraud, and prophesy changes in the direction of admitting wines and light beers, while others minimize the evasions, which they say will gradually disappear, and contend that prohibition has come to stay. America is a vast country, and the truth seems to be that the observance of the law varies with geographical conditions. Generally speaking, notwithstanding bootlegging and other evasions, the bulk of the people observe the law, some because they approve of it, some because they are law-abiding citizens, others because it is too much trouble or they are afraid to break it, and others because intoxicants are too expensive. There is no doubt, however, that the law is continually broken with impunity by a large section of the community, and that a considerable proportion of the law-breakers are persons of position. It is said that where the law is observed the efficiency of the working classes has increased, crime has decreased, and more money is spent in the home. Meanwhile the younger generation is growing up under a temperance regime. Having regard to all the circumstances, it must be admitted that prohibition is still on trial even in America. There is no sufficient evidence that American workmen are more efficient than British or French workmen—in which connection it may be noted that the temperance movement has never caught on in Latin countries.

It must be remembered also that, although the "land of the free" and of great opportunities, America is a land in which autocratic methods prevail, such as would not be tolerated here even if thought to be for the good of the country. Industrial efficiency is an American god, and prohibition is supported by employers for that reason. This support is strengthened by the fact that they themselves can get liquor if they want it. The employer who strongly believes in prohibition for the working classes does not necessarily believe in it for himself.

In Norway "limited prohibition"—which means, as I understand, the forbidding of beer and spirits—has proved a dismal failure. There is more excessive drinking than before. This is frankly admitted by many who formerly advocated prohibition. The Bill to repeal it has been rejected in the Norwegian Parliament by a comparatively narrow majority, but the problem still remains, and, repeal or no repeal, will be the outstanding question at the next election. In Canada there is a strong reaction against prohibition. Five of the eleven provinces have abolished it and substituted State control. Others are on the move in the same direction.

Prohibition is certainly a provocative subject, breeding vituperation, hatred, and malice, whereas moderate restrictions excite but little animosity. In fact, it is difficult to realize that this country has been engaged in one of the greatest social experiments in history. It began with the restrictions imposed by the Food Controller and Liquor Control Board, pre-

sided over by Lord D'Abernon. On the dissolution of the Board certain of its restrictions were embodied in the Licensing Act of 1921, the result of a round-table conference between representatives of the temperance movement, the liquor trade, associations representing the clubs, and the general public.

Shortly stated, the restrictions re-enacted consisted of provisions for earlier closing hours and reduction in the strength of liquor. These arrangements have been supplemented by the higher taxation of drink and the suppression of redundant licences. The results have been amazing and gratifying. The production of beer and spirits has fallen nearly 50 per cent. in ten years and the proceeds of taxation have risen from £33,000,000 in 1910 to £155,000,000 in 1923. Delirium tremens has practically disappeared, and the death-rate from alcoholism has been largely reduced.

Temperance reformers, however, are anxious for still further progress, and it must be admitted that there is much more to be done. The reformers may be divided into two camps—those who recognize the drink trade as part and parcel of our national life, while anxious to control it and make the public-house a place of refreshment instead of a drinking-shop; and those who desire by means of prohibition or local option to abolish the trade altogether. The first section includes the advocates of State ownership of the liquor trade; the disinterested management group, who contend that public-houses should be managed by people not directly interested in the sale of liquor;

and, last and most important, those who rely on the maintenance of existing restrictions and public-house improvement. The second comprises the prohibitionists, local optionists, and old-fashioned teetotallers, who put their trust chiefly in moral suasion and personal example.

It is obvious to the independent observer that reform must proceed on practical lines, and that the habits and wishes of the majority of the people cannot be disregarded. Scottish experiences are interesting. The Act of 1913, which gave local areas the option of deciding in favour of three alternatives—(1) no change, (2) a limiting resolution providing that licences should be reduced by one quarter, or (3) a no licence resolution—has proved abortive. In 1923 the poll showed that two hundred and eight areas voted for no change, twenty-two for no licence, twenty-one for limitation, and six for repeal of limitation previously imposed. The effect is, of course, that so far as concerns the consumption of drink there is no restriction.

Many ardent temperance reformers are adopting a moderate and sensible attitude. For instance, the Students' Christian Movement have issued an admirable little book by Mr. Reason (price 2*s*.). I do not agree with all his views, but his judicial tone is unusual and convincing. Reference may also be made to the excellent report for August, 1924, issued by the Temperance Legislation League and to a well-informed leader in the *Lancet* of 26th July, 1924. The temperance cause is not advanced, as some well-meaning

people seem to think, by virulent attacks on the drink trade, its machinations, political influence, and profit. These excursions may be exciting, but do more harm than good. They only stimulate brewers, distillers, and publicans to increased efforts to protect their position. When all is said, they are engaged in a legitimate business, patronized, although perhaps too well, by the major part of the community. The customers and potential customers of the trade are the people to attack. The point is to convince the public, and especially the young, by precept and example of the advantages of temperance. Personally, although a lifelong teetotaller, I do not believe in prohibition or local option, because I am opposed to slavery. Efficiency is precious, but it is not the sole object of existence. Happiness counts for something and happiness depends on reasonable freedom.

FORD OF THE "FORD"

Mr. Henry Ford is a remarkable person—that goes without saying. He possesses boundless energy and courage. He is a great engineer, a great organizer, and a great advertiser. Even now I am unwillingly advertising the Ford motor-car. No commodity receives so much free advertising. The world cannot escape from Mr. Ford and his works, for the sufficient reasons that he delivers the goods required, and has the showman's art of keeping himself and his products in the limelight without too much expense.

If Mr. Ford collects press-cuttings, they must occupy a space almost as large as his celebrated factories. The jokes issued from his joke factory—a section of his advertising department—most of them poking fun at the Ford car, but nevertheless calling attention to it, appear in almost every popular publication, and are repeated *ad nauseam* by innocents who never imagine that they are helping the distant Mr. Ford to add to his already princely income. But it is useless to be a clever advertiser if you do not supply the right article. Mr. Ford does. I hate to confess, but am forced to admit, that the Ford is the best cheap motor-car in the world. That is the

fundamental explanation of Mr. Ford's phenomenal career, which he describes in collaboration with Mr. Samuel Crowther in "My Life and Work" (Heinemann). The book may be another clever piece of advertising, but it is one of the most remarkable biographies I have read. Mr. Crowther is a clever American journalist, and it is difficult to say how much of the book is Mr. Ford and how much Mr. Crowther, but between them they have produced an interesting volume.

Mr. Ford's father was a Michigan farmer, fairly well-to-do, as he tells us with a quaint little touch of pride in order to contradict reports that he started life in poverty-stricken circumstances. He was born in 1863, and remained at school until he was seventeen, when he became an apprentice in an engineering works. His father wished him to become a farmer, and, in accordance with the notorious practice of fathers, gave him up for lost when he insisted on following his own inclinations. But we must retrace our steps. From an early age the youthful Ford had not only been keenly interested in mechanics, but had conceived the idea that farming methods might be improved by the introduction of mechanical appliances. When twelve years old point was given to this surmise by meeting an engine used to drive a thrashing-machine along the road with a water-tank and coal-cart trailing behind. He describes it as the biggest event of his early years, and, considering his subsequent history, it is almost worthy of comparison with Christopher Columbus's first view of North

America. At the age of twenty or thereabouts he built a steam-car "that ran."

In 1892, when working as an engineer in an electrical power station, he built his first motor-car driven by an internal combustion engine. He continued his experiments, and seven years later (age thirty-six), while in receipt of a salary of some £300 per annum, gave up his job and went into the automobile business in real earnest. For three years he worked as chief engineer of a company formed to exploit his car and in which he held a small amount of stock, but in 1902 resigned, as "the company was not a vehicle for realizing my ideas, but merely a money-making concern—that did not make much money." Then Mr. Ford began again on his own account in a "little one-room brick shop," where he continued his experiments and devoted his mind to the philosophy of business. His discoveries in regard to the latter were not novel, at any rate in this country, whatever they may have been in Detroit, but he expresses them in a vivid and arresting way. *In short, he came to the obvious conclusion that in running a business work and efficiency must come before finance and profit-making.*

In business, the Kingdom of God consists in efficiency. If the business man finds that, all else will be added unto him—easy finance and profits. It is a truism that many businesses are unsuccessful because they are under-capitalized, and that firms well provided with capital can successfully undertake enterprises which would fail in the hands of people

without capital. But these considerations do not limit the accuracy of the general proposition—that no business can hope to succeed unless the primary object is to do the thing in hand as well as it can be done. The purpose of all business is profit, and if the business man does not bear that in mind he will be a failure. At the same time, if he thinks of profit to the exclusion of his job, he will most certainly come to grief. As Burns says :

> If self the wavering balance shake,
> 'Tis rarely right adjusted.

Mr. Ford preaches a sermon upon the evils of financiers (we should call them " company promoters ") in business. These evils are known only too well in this country, and it is instructive to read about the American variety. As Mr. Ford says, " Money-chasing is not business." Legitimate trade profits are not to be made by financial juggles. Even in these days of profiteering and joint-stock companies, hard, honest labour is the basis of true success. Mr. Ford has no sympathy with the theory that work should be restricted to what are known as " working hours." Like most captains of industry, to him all hours are working hours. While others are relieving the tension by playing bridge, Mr. Ford is busy devising improvements in his latest model or mechanical labour-saving devices for the farmer's use, being convinced that agricultural methods are capable of vast improvement. This scheme of life may not be ideal, but it suits the class of which Mr. Ford is a prominent member. The truth is that work is a

pleasure to them. They are entitled to no credit for working harder than other people. They are doing what pleases them; but incidentally, other things being equal, they are more likely to succeed than competitors who are less enthusiastic.

As might be anticipated, simplicity is Mr. Ford's watchword. He thinks that most things have grown too complex and that the world is overwhelmed by tradition and experts. The Ford car is a success because all unnecessary parts have been eliminated and the weight reduced to a minimum. Mr. Ford says, "Why not examine food, clothing, furniture, etc., to ascertain whether simplification would not be advantageous?" Life as he sees it "is not a location, but a journey. Even the man who most feels himself settled is not settled—he is probably sagging back. Life flows. We may live at the same number of the street, but it is never the same man who lives there."

It is now time to return to Mr. Ford's career. We left him, at the age of thirty-nine, experimenting and studying business philosophy in his little one-room brick shop. In 1903 he built a car which won an important motor-race, and then he started the Ford Company, with a capital of about £20,000, of which cash subscriptions amounted to about £6,000. In 1919 his son purchased the 41½ per cent. of the stock not owned by Mr. Ford for some £15,000,000! It was not until 1906–7 that Mr. Ford reduced his models to a small number of cheap, simple, standard types. In that year he sold 8,423 cars. By this

time he was forty-three and in receipt of a good income. With him this was only an incentive to further effort. By the accidental discovery of vanadium steel he still further improved the Ford by reducing the weight. It is interesting to note, by the way, that Britain did much for Mr. Ford. First he tells us she produced the silent gas-engine which gave him much food for thought in his early days when he read about it in an English technical publication; and, secondly, as no American steel-maker could manufacture vanadium steel, he was compelled to import an Englishman.

In 1910–11 the Ford Company sold 34,525 cars. In 1920–1 they sold 1,250,000, or at the rate of about 4,000 per day! At a moderate computation Mr. Ford's income must be, say, £7,000,000 per annum! An astonishing achievement, especially when we remember that he started his business only twenty-two years ago and that he was then forty years of age. His account of the ingenious methods adopted to improve the production of his car reads like a romance. But he has other activities. He runs a school in which he teaches two hundred boys, by novel and apparently sound methods, inasmuch as they receive a technical and business as well as a general education. It is not a charitable institution. The scholars work and receive wages, and the school pays its way. Mr. Ford also runs a hospital with 600 beds for the inhabitants of Detroit. Each patient has his own room and bath, the charge, including nursing and medical attendance, being about £1 per day, with

an additional charge for operations. The hospital also pays its way!

Mr. Ford has a happy knack of making everything pay except his collection of birds, "which are needed for beauty and companionship." But perhaps the birds are no exception, for he mentions that they are required "for the strictly economic reason that they destroy harmful insects." He tells with pride of his friendship with John Burroughs, the naturalist who "lived a wholesome life" on the farm where he was born "in surroundings which made for quietness of mind," and might "have been described as inspector of birds' nests and hillside paths." "Of course, it does not pay in dollars and cents," adds Mr. Ford, naïvely. Burroughs was converted by his friend from his horror of "industrial progress" and led "to value and approve modern devices," and in particular the Ford motor-car, which he freely used to track unfortunate birds to their nests. As this conversion did not occur until Burroughs was seventy, happily it may be regarded in the light of a death-bed repentance.

Much of the book is devoted to a disquisition on political economy. Mr. Ford does not mention Adam Smith and other pundits, which is not surprising, as veneration of the past is one of his chief bugbears. Even in his works he keeps no written record of experiments for fear that promising ideas may be rejected because they have been tried before. To resume. In far-away Detroit, Mr. Ford is busy, no doubt with Mr. Crowther's assistance, in analysing

the economic system in the same way that he analysed the construction of the motor-car. It must, however, be admitted that he is still in the analytical stage. He has not yet issued his new model. Meanwhile he confines his observations to wages, banking, and service to the community. Wages, he tells us, should be based on "what the business will stand." The word "stand," however, is not defined. Mr. Ford, to do him justice, pays higher wages than most employers and gives due attention to proper working conditions, but he makes a colossal income into the bargain. The question arises, therefore, whether he is paying his workers sufficient or whether he is not charging too much for his cars, because he emphatically asserts that a manufacturer is under an obligation to supply the public at the lowest possible rate.

He does not mention that to-day the world is demanding a revaluation of human effort. Mr. Ford is no doubt a genius and a public benefactor, but some people question whether he is worth as much to the community as, say, 20,000 schoolmasters, or 15,000 sea-captains, or 70,000 engine-drivers, or 140,000 domestic servants. But there he is—a standing example of invention, efficiency, and flaming enthusiasm.

How can you deal with such a problem? Even the United States Government, the Municipality of Detroit, or Mr. Lenin could not emulate his astonishing feats. When the United States of America Government tried to build aeroplanes, they wasted £200,000,000 and failed to produce the goods, whereas

Mr. Ford from his little brick shop on an initial capital of £6,000 supplies the world with what it requires. He says that he is only beginning his career.

His gospel of wealth and public service is characteristic. He begins by saying, "We are growing out of the worship of material possessions. It is no longer a distinction to be rich, and to be rich is no longer a common ambition. People do not care for money as they once did. What we accumulate by way of useless surplus does us no honour." This statement will cause surprise and might lead to the idea that the manners and customs of Detroit differ from those of other parts of the United States and of this country. Mr. Ford leaves us under no such illusion, for he goes on to say that the accumulation of large sums of money is laudable "if one has vast plans . . . to make the industrial desert bloom like the rose." In other words, service, according to Mr. Ford, consists in supplying the public with cheap commodities and amenities and in accumulating and using capital for that purpose. As the world seems bent on material comfort, there is a good deal of force in his point of view, narrow and incomplete as it may be.

Many people will deplore Mr. Ford's princely income, and that such enormous power should be vested in a single individual; but we are still faced with the eternal problem. How can the world get what it wants without these creative, organizing geniuses, who touch the Aladdin's lamp of Nature and produce

all sorts of wonders? Mankind is confronted with two alternatives: one, the simple life, which many people talk about but which few are prepared to live; and the other, the necessity for the Ford class, who alone can produce in vast quantities and at cheap prices the things upon which the world has set its mind. How can this class be chained up for the service of mankind?

The problem reminds me of the story of the small parson who was addressing a troop of Australian soldiers on the qualities of the Devil. He concluded by remarking, "Happily he is in chains, but he is still very active and may get at you—and you—and you——" pointing to various members of the audience, whereupon one of the men stood up and said, "Excuse me, sir, but it looks as if he might just as well be loose!" The parson answered, "I fear you are right, my friend! The Devil is such a clever and industrious creature that you can't really chain him up!"

It must not be inferred that I regard Mr. Ford as anything approaching a devil. He is a mechanical fanatic and believes that all the ills of life may be ameliorated by mechanical devices and chiefly those emanating from the Ford works. He may be right; but life is a complicated affair, and many people are glad to think they possess a refuge of the mind incapable of invasion even by the ubiquitous Ford motor-car.

IDEALS, CITIZENSHIP, AND EDUCATION

Sir Henry Hadow, the learned Vice-Chancellor of the Sheffield University, has published in book-form the brilliant lectures which he delivered at Glasgow in 1922 ("Citizenship," Clarendon Press, 6*s*.). They cover a wide field—historical, ethical, and educational.

His analysis of Ideals of Conduct from the Greeks onwards is attractive, and not wanting in humour, as may be seen from the following extracts:

In all material possessions there is a law of diminishing returns. One umbrella is a necessity of life; a second, in these dishonest days, is a precaution; a third is a mere superfluity. But this is not true in the sphere of intellectual equipment. A man who knows one foreign language may double his value by learning a second, and quadruple it by learning a third; a scientific research may produce no results in five years and revolutionize the world in ten; an administrator may find that each year of experience brings him added wisdom and a firmer grasp of public affairs. The real differences between men are intrinsic; differences of character and knowledge and ability; the externals of wealth and power are of value in so far as they testify to something beyond themselves. A rich man may be estimable for the qualities that have won him his wealth, a man of high station for the training that has taught him the lesson of *noblesse oblige*; it is equally foolish to admire them for what they have and to refuse them recognition for what they are. The rank, no doubt, is but the guinea stamp, and a guinea stamp upon copper should have no currency; but it does not require Plato to remind us that not all men are golden.

Authority and liberty are like the centripetal and centrifugal

forces which keep the world in its orbit. Take away the centripetal, we should wander into outer darkness and perish of cold ; take away the centrifugal, we should fall into the sun and perish of combustion. Our existence depends on a due balance between them.

Perhaps the best essay is that dealing with Internationalism and Cosmopolitanism. The four prevalent errors are summed up thus :

The first is cosmopolitanism by absorption, the forcible unification of different and even disparate peoples into a single system of government or control.

Second and converse to this is that kind of tepid humanitarianism which cares equally for all people because it cares very little for any.

Third, and more curious than either, is the false perspective which recognizes the differences of claim and actually transposes them. It was said of Mirabeau that he loved all men except those whom he knew personally ; it may be said of many of our philanthropists and reformers that their own country is the first target of their criticism and the last object of their allegiance. They are not to be confused with the mistaken idealists who side against their country either because they believe her to be in the wrong, like Mr. Stead, during the Boer War, or because they hold that chastisement would be good for her like the Defeatists in the Russian Revolution ; these people have simply reversed the telescope and regard Borrioboola-Gha as nearer than Bloomsbury.

The fourth error is at the present day most widespread and most dangerous. It is the belief that international policy can be established by cutting cross-sections of different peoples or races and combining them to the exclusion of all other constituent factors.

About education Sir Henry says pregnant things. He thinks its aims should be : First, to equip the student to earn his living. Second, to prepare him to play his part in the political and economic life of his country. Third, to satisfy his spiritual needs through the mysteries of religion, the wonders of painting and music, the beauty and depth of great

literature. If one may venture to criticize so renowned an educationist, I would say that he does not in terms attach sufficient importance to the necessity of teaching clear thinking—the first essential in life. A student may be taught the implements necessary to enable him to earn his living—mathematics, languages, and so forth—and yet be ignorant of the methods of thought that will fit him to form sound opinions and refute false arguments.

In discussing marriage, Sir Henry Hadow quotes a gem from Hegel, the German philosopher:

> "Love," he says, "means in general the consciousness of my unity with another, such that I am not isolated from myself but win my self-consciousness only by giving up my explicit being, and thereby know myself as the unity of myself with the other and of the other with me."

Being a bachelor, Sir Henry wisely refrains from analysing this definition, although he points out that Hegel interpreted unity in a curious fashion, to wit: "Women may be educated, but they are not made for the higher sciences, for philosophy and for certain arts which require universality." The Hegelian definition of love is not likely to commend itself. As Byron says, "Human love is not the growth of human will!" And as some one else says, "Who can give laws to lovers?"

These essays should be widely read. They contain a mass of information in brief compass—for example, a luminous historical account of the Dominions and India. The bibliography in itself is a remarkable piece of work well worth the price of the book.

PROTECTING POSTERITY

Be under no misapprehension, this has nothing to do with Free Trade or Protection. Nevertheless, I refer to a new movement which, unlike most self-respecting movements, has no subscription list. I refer to the campaign by Mr. J. C. Squire and others to improve architectural methods and induce the public to take more interest in buildings amongst which they live and which their successors will inherit. Mr. Squire and his associates regard buildings as sacred things. And so they are when we consider how long they last and how they make or mar a town or country-side. It is a curious problem why most people are so apathetic not only in regard to architecture, the art of building, but in regard to buildings themselves. They pass them by and often enter them day after day without noticing their special features. Indeed, with few exceptions, important buildings in most large towns are little known but to those who have occasion to visit them.

How many Londoners, for example, ever give a thought to the beautiful or historic buildings by which they are surrounded, or even to the buildings—good, bad, or indifferent—which they pass several times a day? They know Westminster Abbey,

St. Paul's, the Houses of Parliament, Buckingham and St. James's Palaces, Somerset House, the National Gallery, the Mansion House, the Bank of England, the Law Courts, and a few more prominent places, but this is the limit of their knowledge. How few could point out Inigo Jones's wonderful Banqueting House, from one of the windows of which Charles I. walked to the scaffold! There are several reasons. One, lack of observation. To be observed a building must stand in a prominent position. Most people do not look to the right or left unless to gaze into a shop window. This may seem an insignificant reason, nevertheless it is a sound one. Two, lack of information concerning the designers of particular buildings. Unfortunate though it may be, few people are interested in buildings that have no human note. Stone, bricks, and mortar, however well modelled, enthuse only a very limited class. The ordinary Briton wants something more to interest him. Somerset House—one of the most beautiful buildings in the world—is chiefly known because it happens to be the repository of the wills of the departed, the home of the Registrar-General, and the mysterious temple where the Inland Revenue authorities levy tribute in the shape of Income-Tax and Estate Duty. Few inquire when or why it was built or by whom it was designed.

Probably most of us would find it hard to name the twelve most important British architects—dead or living. Wren (St. Paul's), Scott (the Houses of Parliament), and Lutyens (the Cenotaph) would

probably exhaust most rolls of architectural saints. I do not speak of the cultured but of the mass of the people. It is said that in France different conditions prevail. Sir T. G. Jackson, in his remarkable "Renaissance of Roman Architecture," Part III. (Cambridge University Press), tells that a French rag-and-bone man, when discussing Noyon Cathedral, remarked: "It is beautiful because it is of the thirteenth century." He suggests that such an incident would not be likely in this country.

Generalizations from slender premises are notoriously dangerous, and I am loath to draw inferences from an intelligent remark by one Frenchman. Nevertheless, probably Sir T. G. Jackson is right in thinking that the mass of the French show more intelligent interest in beautiful buildings than most people at home. The same may be said of places of natural beauty such as Box Hill. The French certainly treat both buildings and sylvan spots more tenderly. They do not deface the former or litter the latter with paper, orange-peel, and empty bottles. They regard property owned by the State or Municipality as their own. To use Viscount Grey's words when describing what should be the public attitude, "they take a pride in it and treat it with the same care and respect as they would their own gardens." Let us hope that with increased facilities for enjoyment our people will learn to follow the French example.

Architecture as a profession in this country is the product of the last 200 years. During that period

the professional circle, as in the case of other professions, has become more and more closely guarded. Advertising is, of course, and properly, taboo, so that only in rare cases do the public know by whom buildings have been designed. It has been suggested that as a measure of public safety, and to stimulate interest in architects and architecture, every building should bear in a conspicuous position the name of the architect. This admirable proposal deserves careful consideration, but if adopted it might lead bands of æsthetic enthusiasts to make reprisals upon designers of architectural monstrosities. Third, the lack of popular brightly written literature dealing with buildings and architecture—by literature I mean not only books but newspaper and magazine articles. Most architectural books, etc., are too dry and technical. They are dominated by descriptions of architectural styles—Gothic, Greek, Roman, Romanesque, and so on, instead of directing attention to the main essentials of architecture—namely, beauty and suitability, qualities in which every one is or should be interested. A man may learn to appreciate fine buildings without knowing much about architectural styles. As Sir T. G. Jackson says, architecture must be adapted to the demands of utility instead of our needs being adapted to architectural tradition.

The original proposals for rebuilding Regent Street are a glaring example of the absurdity of neglecting this principle. The suggestion that the shop windows should be set in deep embrasures, flanked with great masses of masonry, was obviously a flagrant error

and commercially impossible. Writers on architecture seldom strike the dramatic note that makes a wide public appeal. For instance, take Liverpool. A mere description of the many fine buildings in that city would probably be dull reading ; but if the writer prefaced his remarks by pointing out that the Cathedral, which, when completed, will be the largest in the country, was designed by a young man of twenty-one, and the famous St. George's Hall by one of twenty-three, these great buildings would have a new interest for most of his readers. We all want a little butter with our bread.

In conclusion, architecture is specially interesting at the present time. New methods of construction are certain to be more widely adopted to meet modern requirements, and the use of household labour-saving devices is only in its infancy. Few people realize the vast changes in constructional methods due to the use of steel frame-work, which enables the architect to dispense with heavily-built columns and walls. Town-planning is proceeding apace, and more attention is being paid to the necessity for bright-looking as well as shapely dwellings. Dull, light-absorbing materials make gloomy streets. White paint is a wonderful aid to exhilaration. The East End of London would be entirely changed by a three-yearly application of this expensive but enlivening garment. So far as concerns material things, next to climate and food the dwellings in which we live and work are the most important factors for health and happiness. Therefore we are

all interested, directly or indirectly, in architecture.

It is only by a well-informed and intelligent public opinion that we can hope to improve architectural methods. Just as medicine is not the sole concern of doctors, or law of lawyers, so architecture is not the sole concern of architects. Doctors, lawyers, and architects are public servants, and while leaving technical matters in their hands it is necessary that the laity should exhibit an intelligent interest in the general trend of medicine, law, and architecture, not for the purpose of being their own doctors, lawyers, or architects, but in order to take part in advancing reforms and opposing unwise changes. The enormous powers wielded by local authorities elected by popular vote alone make this a duty. For instance, the London County Council still require steel construction of a weight far in excess of that used in America and elsewhere, with the result that in London the construction of steel-frame buildings is very expensive. The man in the street cannot say who is right, but the discrepancy justifies him in demanding an inquiry.

Architecture has another and less utilitarian side. Few things add more to the minor pleasures of life than an observing and inquiring mind concerning buildings to be seen during our travels from day to day whether at home or abroad. The Institute of British Architects confers a medal for the best commercial building of the year. Sometimes, as I go about London, I look to see whether I agree with their decision. This gives an interest to daily life

and makes tolerable delays in traffic. The time can usually be spent to advantage. Adapting the wording of Wren's celebrated epitaph, it might well be said, "For pleasure and instruction, look around you."

"GOODWILL TO MEN"

Human Progress

What has made mankind less cruel? You may retort, "Are they less cruel? How about the War?" While admitting the relevancy of these questions, I would reply that cruelties of war are no test. Abnormalities breed abnormalities. Furthermore, human beings think and act in compartments. Men selfish and callous in one relation of life are often kind and sympathetic in another. The employer who sweats his workers is not infrequently a generous patron of charities. But in some respects even the conduct of wars has improved. Until 1864, when the International Red Cross was formed, as a result of Dr. Dunant's wonderful book describing the horrors of the battle of Solferino in 1859, doctors, nurses, hospitals, etc., were not free from attack, and surgical and medical arrangements were negligible. Dr. Dunant was a Swiss, but Britain did her share. A memorandum by Florence Nightingale was one of the most notable features of "A Souvenir of Solferino." No appeal ever had a quicker response or achieved a greater purpose. After this digression I again put my question.

What has made mankind less cruel ? Let us begin with the seventeenth century. We find that the benign doctrines of Christ had been obscured and perverted. In most European countries religious persecutions accompanied by horrible cruelties were frequent. The administration of justice, so called, was accompanied by indescribable horrors—ferocious sentences, secret accusations, *lettres de cachet*, unfair and secret trials were everyday occurrences. Prisons were foul and horrible. Brandings and other mutilations were frequent and men and women were done to death in all sorts of barbarous ways. Principles of punishment there were none, savage sentences being inflicted for vindictive purposes, and often for trifling crimes. Britain was in advance of other countries, but even her criminal law was harsh and unjust. The laws of evidence and the bias of judges frequently led to grave injustices, while the scale of punishments and condition of the prisons were appalling.

The eighteenth century witnessed a marked change. New ideas of liberty, humanity, and toleration had emerged. France led the van of the new movement. Montesquieu (1689–1755), in his famous " Lettres Persanes " (1721), and still more famous " Esprit des Lois " (1748), was perhaps the first writer to expound true principles of toleration, and those which should govern a penal code. Other French writers followed : Voltaire (1694–1778), Helvétius (1715–71), and the Encyclopædists, a distinguished band of authors, who, under the editorship of D'Alembert (1717–83) and Diderot (1713–84), produced a remarkable work

dealing with science, religion, government, and most other branches of knowledge. By attacking worn-out traditions, tyranny, and privilege, and preaching liberty and tolerance, these writers profoundly affected European thought. But it remained for a young Italian, aged only twenty-five, the Marquis Beccaria (1735–94), to sum up in masterly fashion the aspirations of the time regarding crimes and punishments. His book, " Dei Delitti e delle pene," is one of the most notable ever written, and he is admittedly the father of modern criminal codes. His name is little known except to those versed in jurisprudence. I remember my surprise when a student on discovering that Bentham (1748–1832), Romilly (1757–1818), and other great reformers of our penal code, were disciples of an Italian of whom I had never heard. His teachings rapidly spread throughout Europe and at once produced much-needed reforms in many States, largely due to a Commentary by Voltaire, written in his own mordant fashion. Even the Empress Catherine II (1729–96) invited Beccaria to Russia to assist in preparing a new legal code, an invitation which he declined, by the way. As works of practical and immediate utility, probably " Dei Delitti " and " A Souvenir of Solferino " have no equals. Beccaria admitted that he derived his inspiration from Montesquieu and the Encyclopædists, but he it was who gave practical expression to their views and roused the world to action. To-day his doctrines have been adopted, at any rate in principle, in all civilized countries.

He taught that:

(1) The object of punishment is not revenge but prevention and reform. The criminal must be prevented from committing further offences and punished as an example to others. Efforts must also be made to reform him. (2) Punishments must fit the crime. If the same penalty be attached to greater and lesser crimes they will be regarded as of equal importance. If the punishment for killing a pheasant be the same as for killing a man, persons with criminal intentions will draw no distinction between the two crimes. (3) Punishment should be the same for all classes. (4) The law should be prompt and certain. (5) Every citizen must be at liberty to do any act not legally unlawful. (6) Secret accusations, *lettres de cachet*, and secret trials are pernicious. (7) Persons charged should be allowed to give evidence. (8) Torture is useless, barbarous, and conducive to false verdicts. (9) The chief aim of every good system of legislation should be to prevent crimes rather than to punish them. (10) The surest but most difficult means of preventing crimes is to improve education. (11) Human justice should be based on public utility and the object of legislation should be to ensure happiness to the greatest number and the least possible misery.

No account of the humanitarian movement, however short and imperfect, would be tolerable which omitted a reference to John Howard, the prison reformer (1726–90), of whom Burke remarked:

> He has visited all Europe, not to survey the sumptuousness

of palaces or the stateliness of temples; not to make accurate measurements of the remains of ancient grandeur, nor to form a scale of the curiosity of modern art, nor to collect medals or collect manuscripts, but to dive in the depths of dungeons, to plunge into the infection of hospitals, to survey the mansions of sorrow and pain, to take the gauge and dimensions of misery, depression, and contempt, to remember the forgotten, to attend to the neglected, to visit the forsaken, and to compare and collate the distresses of all men in all countries. . . . It was a voyage of discovery, a circumnavigation of charity.

The period since 1764 has been marked by continuous progress, not only in the administration of the criminal law, but in all branches of humanitarianism. In other parts of Europe the flag has been carried by philosophers aided by politicians. In this country, while lawyers, philosophers, and politicians have done their share, the churches have rendered valuable aid. The Evangelicals, who fought slavery and carried the first Factory Acts, are entitled to special praise.

Now let us see if we can answer my question. You may say it has been answered already. I do not agree. Apart from philosophers, religious teachers, philanthropists, lawyers, and politicians, there is an underlying cause—the growing desire for self-preservation due to education and emancipation. In other words, the desire for justice and the horror of oppression are due primarily to the necessity for preserving our own skins as well as those of our fellow-countrymen. What is your fate to-day may be mine to-morrow. Of course, this explanation does not cover the whole field of humanitarianism—the abolition of slavery, suppression of child labour, and the like. This branch must be ascribed exclusively

to the teachings of Christ, enforced, strangely enough, by those of that eccentric genius, Rousseau (1712–78). This subject has been suggested by Professor Phillipson's brilliant and luminous account of the reform of the criminal law. The book is called " Three Criminal Law Reformers : Beccaria, Bentham, and Romilly " (Dent). I can strongly recommend it.

THE GOOD OLD DAYS

Recently I saw an advertisement of a book called "Madame Vestris and Her Times," by Mr. Charles E. Pearce (Stanley Paul). It made me remember that forty years ago I had known a lawyer's clerk who every night for weeks had bailed this celebrated actress and her no less celebrated husband, Charles James Mathews, out of a sponging-house in Cursitor Street, Chancery Lane, taken them to the theatre to do their work, and then returned with them to Cursitor Street, where the three sat cross-legged on Mr. and Mrs. Mathew's bed and partook of a supper of cold chicken and champagne. It may be explained that a "sponging-house" was a licensed place of detention for persons arrested for debt. Here they were kept temporarily to give them a chance of settling with their creditors, instead of being sent direct to a debtors' prison. Meanwhile, for adequate reasons, they were allowed out on bail for short periods. The charges were high, and the accommodation limited and bad. Sponging-houses and debtors' prisons were abolished by the Debtors Act, 1869.

For the reason stated, having a special interest in Madame Vestris and her husband, I purchased and

read this entertaining book, which throws a lurid light on the "good old days." Madame Vestris was the elder daughter of Bartolozzi, the celebrated engraver—a remarkable person who lived a long and "rapid" life, dying in 1815 at the age of eighty-eight. Madame was born when her father was seventy. She made her debut in the year of his death, when she was eighteen, having been married two years earlier to Armand Vestris, a dancing master, grandson of the famous Vestris whom Parisians termed "Le Dieu de la Danse." For nearly forty years she fascinated the public by her lovely contralto voice, her magnetic gaiety, the perfection of her figure, the grace of her movements, and the indefinable charm with which she invested every part she undertook. She was a favourite theme of conversation with all ranks. Her frailties (and they were many) were regarded with indulgence. Both on and off the stage she provided excellent copy, and the newspapers were full of her doings, real or imaginary.

In those days most newspapers were in the habit of publishing innuendoes concerning well-known personages, and especially ladies of the stage.

The morals of the time provided ample opportunities. Most theatres were usually verging on bankruptcy, and were maintained partly by the public and partly by contributions from young bloods anxious to associate with the lady members of the cast. The Rev. John Richardson says in his "Recollections" that one important duty of the

small "tigers" who rode behind the cabriolets driven by men of fashion, and pictured so vividly in "Martin Chuzzlewit," was to jump down and ascertain the name and address of any woman who attracted their masters' attention. This would be about 1830.

The aim of every "buck" was to be talked about. Some kept negro servants and some prize-fighters. Mr. T. H. Duncombe, when speaking of his father, the notorious "Tom Duncombe," Radical M.P. for Finsbury (born 1796), remarked: "As a young man he was expected to do what other young men of family and fortune invariably did. He must be at once sportsman, dandy, gourmand, rake, senator, gambler, and interested in the prize-ring."

In these "good old days," however, there were limits. Rossini's "Moses in Egypt," touching as it did upon a Biblical subject, was not thought fit for the theatre, and Madame Vestris was much criticized for impropriety in appearing in breeches as Captain Macheath in "The Beggar's Opera," and in the rôle of "Don Giovanni in London." Notwithstanding the critics, both pieces were a huge success.

According to Mr. Pearce, in the 'thirties Lord Fife was the chief supporter of the ballet. Upon one famous dancer, Mlle. Noblet, this old roué spent £80,000 for the privilege of gazing on her pirouettes. But he had a rival in the Lord Chamberlain, the rascally Marquess of Hertford. In 1838, at the age of forty, after many amorous adventures, Madame

Vestris settled down and married her second husband, Charles James Mathews, son of the wonderful mimic and entertainer, Charles Mathews, and father of Sir Charles Mathews, who was Public Prosecutor for several years. Charles James Mathews had an interesting career. Trained as an architect, and becoming District Surveyor at Bow, London, he took to the stage at the age of thirty-two, and became one of the most notable comedians in history and a great theatrical reformer. His strong point was natural comedy, unaided by grotesque make-up, grimaces, or queer contortions. He played in his ordinary clothes, and may be regarded as the Apostolic father of Sir John Hare, Charles Wyndham, Charles Hawtrey, Cyril Maude, and Seymour Hicks.

Mathews also introduced the use of appropriate scenery for topical plays. Drawing-rooms were fitted up like drawing-rooms with suitable carpets and furniture, accessories not seen on the stage before his day, so it is said. No man was more widely known in London. The marriage was a success. Mathews and Vestris lived together in perfect amity for eighteen years, notwithstanding serious financial difficulties, leading eventually to imprisonment for debt and bankruptcy, fully dealt with in the " Life of Charles James Mathews." Madame Vestris herself was a theatrical reformer. The day before her farewell performance in 1854, the *Morning Post* said :

> What has not Madame Vestris done for the English stage ? Let those who are close watchers of its phases answer. She has banished vulgarity, coarse manners, *double entendre*, and imperti-

nence from the boards over which she presided, and in their place has evoked the benefits that flow from a dramatic interpretation of polished manners, refinement, and politeness. Her geeen-room was the resort of the learned, the witty, and the wise, a miniature picture of polite and well-bred society whence a wholesome example spread itself on all within its influence. Once communicated to the stage, it became communicable to the public, and sure we are that a desirable tone of refinement both in manners and conversation has been extensively spread in private life by the lady-like deportment and acting of Madame Vestris.

Her vitality was wonderful. Although for nearly forty years she had led a life of continual excitement, until two years before her death she never appeared to be growing old, and never showed signs of weariness. When past fifty her figure was as symmetrical, her smile as bewitching, her voice as fascinating as in her younger days.

She died aged fifty-nine, saddened and embittered by monetary troubles and theatrical disputes. Her husband survived her for twenty-two years, dying in 1878. Madame Vestris had a complex character —a striking example of human inconsistency. In the earlier stages of her private life her side-slips from the path of virtue seem to have been many and frequent, but in a period of licence her conversation was modest and her manners refined. As appears from the extract from the *Morning Post*, she exhibited the same qualities on the stage, and did much to elevate the tone of the theatre. She possessed in a high degree the dominating quality of all great people —mental energy—ever scheming, ever contriving, and ever doing. Not always wisely, be it said. One

of the greatest showmen in history, with the rare gift of interesting the public, not only in her performance, but in herself, for forty years she held her position as a popular heroine.

THE REAL SMUTS

General Smuts has long been a critic of what may be described as realism. When the Peace Treaty was signed in the historic Hall of Mirrors on the memorable Saturday, June 28, 1919, he caused a mild sensation by circulating a typewritten memorandum in which he said that he had signed the Treaty, not because he agreed with its provisions, but because he felt that it was a step towards peace. Peace itself would not come from the Treaty, but from the League of Nations, and from the hearts and consciences of men who would determine that there should be no more war. His criticism of the Treaty was not regarded with favour, as, whatever may have been its defects, it reflected the feelings of the Allied peoples at the time. The General had already given an indication of the tendency of his mind, having been one of the founders of the League of Nations, in support of which idea he had written a memorandum—one of the most brilliant documents produced during the sittings of the Conference.

The General is a curious mixture of realism and idealism. He is a first-class fighting man—rather inclined to underrate his opponents. Every one knows of his exploits in the Boer War. In the late war he

was the only fighting statesman with the exception of the brave General Botha, with whom he worked in close co-operation, acting in the same capacity as Alexander Hamilton did for George Washington. Then, again, General Smuts is a stickler for law and order. No ruler has been more resolute in quelling Labour disputes with a drastic hand. That is one side of his complex character. The other is displayed in his campaign against the reign of force in Europe. In short, he is a combination of Cromwell and Ruskin. But if it came to the point, I should not care to rely too much on the Ruskin element. These first-class fighting men are apt on provocation to revert to primitive methods.

The General's piercing and compelling eye is a good indication of his dominating personality. This impression is confirmed by his alert, well-knit figure and energetic movements. He is a great walker, and when in London during the war spent most of his Sundays in taking long country walks. On one occasion, when unexpectedly required for urgent business, it became necessary to scour a great part of Buckinghamshire in order to retrieve him. It was not until a late hour that he arrived at Danny Park, Sussex, where Mr. Lloyd George and other members of the Cabinet were awaiting him. The General is now fifty-five. He has a keen, penetrating intellect. Rhodes early predicted a career for "slim (cute) Jannie Smuts." His prophecy proved correct. "Jannie" Smuts became one of Kruger's right-hand men, and drafted many of his State documents,

although it is said that he often disagreed with him.

The complexities of General Smuts's character are due no doubt in some measure to those of birth and training. Born in South Africa of Boer parents, brought up on a farm, in early youth a shepherd, educated partly at Victoria College, Stellenbosch, and partly at Christ's College, Cambridge, where he achieved great distinctions, a practising barrister, in supreme command of the Republican Army in Cape Colony at the age of thirty-one, a member of the Transvaal Cabinet at the age of thirty-six, can one wonder at this romantic figure with a sword in one hand and a peace-tract in the other—a flaming example of the incongruities of life ? He is a voluble speaker—capable of great flights of eloquence, during which he either overcomes or one forgets the slight Dutch accent noticeable in calmer moments. As a Parliamentary debater he stands in the first rank, his quick mind being of great advantage. The results of a legal training are most persistent. It is easier to change the leopard's spots than to obliterate its mark. Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Asquith, President Wilson, Sir Robert Horne, and M. Poincaré are striking examples. Both " Cromwell Smuts " and " Ruskin Smuts " are lawyers to the tips of their fingers, but while " Cromwell Smuts " is a stern judge, ready to assume the black cap if he thinks that justice so requires, " Ruskin Smuts " is a legal sentimentalist, strong on compromise and arbitration.

In private life the General is an attractive person

and admirable conversationalist, full of witty, original remarks. On rare occasions he can unbend and be as gay as a youth of eighteen. His habits are simple. By inclination he is a solitary, fond of books and meditation. He smokes but little. He has several sorts of courage—all well developed : the courage of the soldier—the courage of the fearless politician—and the courage of the perfervid missionary. His public life in South Africa has been one long arduous fight. He is a true adherent of the British Empire. Often when I looked at him seated in the Peace Conference I thought how much Britain owed to the sagacity and foresight of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, who had converted an opponent into a friend.

The General's attitude regarding the international situation emphasizes the vital difference of opinion that exists, not only amongst different nations, but within the borders of each country, more or less. One type of man believes that universal brotherhood and peace will result from shaking hands with your enemies and making them grateful, while the other type believes that there is no such thing as national gratitude and that the only safe procedure is to put your enemy down and keep him down. And there the issues join. General Smuts takes one view, and the French, who understand the strength of national gratitude, take the other. The General does not seem to realize that the French are unaffected by sermonizing. It is easy to criticize when some one else has to " bell the cat." If General Smuts were

Prime Minister of Great Britain, I wonder what would happen if M. Poincaré declined to take any notice of "Ruskin Smuts's" sermons? I wonder whether "Cromwell Smuts" would emerge from round the corner?

BIOGRAPHICAL VERBOSITY

Biography has been compared with portrait painting. Not a bad analogy. Both depend upon the discerning spirit. The first essential of a good portrait is a clever artist, and the first essential of a good biography a skilful writer. A great artist or great biographer can make much of a dull subject, while many a promising one has been ruined by unskilful treatment. It must, however, be confessed that successful biography demands qualifications not required for portrait painting. The biographer must be a good showman—a sort of literary Barnum—with the knack of showing off his dead lion stuffed with straw, or more attractive material—to the best advantage. An uncommon gift. Thousands have written biographies, but the successful ventures in our language do not perhaps exceed a couple of dozen. I do not refer to mere books of reference, but to biographies that are read for the sake of reading. Lively writing is a rare art, specially necessary for biography—the power to sustain interest and the gift of selection. Most biographies are not written with the sole object of producing an interesting book. In some cases the author's main purpose seems to be to write what would please the deceased.

In others the biography is written to please his relatives by whom it has been commissioned.

Mr. Asquith says that modern biographies are ponderous and diffuse. He might well have added that they contain too much soap. These peculiarities need occasion no surprise when we consider the conditions under which most works of this sort are produced. A man of more or less distinction dies. His relations or executors look for a suitable person to write his biography. A fee is arranged and the deceased's papers delivered to the scribe, who proceeds to turn out one, two, or more fat and often rather dreary volumes. Fees have to be earned, and clients do not appreciate the beauties of selection and compression. They expect the whole story, but of course with the limitations imposed by the maxim, "*De mortuis nil nisi bonum*" ("Of the dead speak nothing but good"). Most biographies are more or less panegyrics, but there is a marked distinction between a biography written on independent lines and one written to the order of a family. Boswell wrote a panegyric, but did not conceal his hero's idiosyncrasies. Had he been employed to write the life by "the family," I wonder whether he would have been equally frank? Like portrait painting, writing on commission has its difficulties.

All amiable professional men are properly anxious to please a kind and generous patron. But admitting this, let us hope in the interests of literature that the professional biographers, of whom there is quite a little group, will take Mr. Asquith's criticism to heart

by explaining to their generous patrons—I hope they are generous—that a comparatively small but brilliant book, containing only a strong tincture of honey, is a better memorial than a diffuse complimentary record of the deceased's life, coupled with an adulatory estimate of his character. The manufacture and sale of words is a curious business. There are three kinds of biographers—those who write on commission, those who write not for pecuniary reasons but because they want to write, and those who are out to make money by producing a book that is sure to sell. The public have no use for dull books. They want revelations and wit. They may deplore such a book, but they buy it. Therefore authors who write character sketches for popular consumption seek to make their wares attractive by sharp sayings and stinging criticism. Eulogy is not popular. Mordant wit and apparent inside knowledge are the chief essentials. Such books add to the gaiety of nations, and so long as the public understand that they are written to make money, and not as a public duty, no great harm is done, although some thin-skinned individuals may be butchered in the process.

The ethics of biography involve interesting questions. How far should the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, be narrated? To what extent is private life proper matter for biographical description and comment? In practice, unpleasant details are usually supplied in instalments to future generations. There is something to be said for this method which avoids lacerating the feelings of living

persons, and perhaps even the spirits of the departed become less sensitive as time passes. Who knows ?

Goethe said in the preface to his autobiography, " Truth and Poetry From My Own Life," that the object of biography is to show how the man was affected by his environment, and how his environment was affected by him. That is not a bad definition.

A biography should not be a photograph. The object of a picture is to display the sitter's character through the medium of his face. There is no occasion perhaps to display all the blemishes. When Cromwell had his picture painted the artist omitted the wart on his nose. The Protector asked that it should be added to the picture. Perhaps he felt that it was necessary in order to show the manner of man he was and that the wart was not so disfiguring as his enemies alleged.

In dealing with his subject's private life the object of the biographer should be to state whatever may be necessary to explain his character and achievements. Obviously, disclosures that may be essential in some cases would be inappropriate in others. For example, while the immoralities of a great inventor might in no way concern his life-work, those of a preacher or social reformer might throw a strong and perhaps lurid light upon his actions. Carlyle said that history is the essence of innumerable biographies ; and Emerson, " There is properly no history, only biography." With all due respect, I think they over-estimated the importance of outstanding his-

torical figures. History is made not only by the achievements of great men, but by changes in the habits and psychology of the people and also by national and class movements which spring from the aspirations and needs of those engaged in them, and which cannot be attributed to the doings of any particular individual. If biographies are the raw material of history, they should at any rate not be misleading. Balzac remarked, " In journalism everything that is probable is true." Whether this is an accurate estimate of the journalistic outlook or not, the saying certainly does not apply to biography. Considering his responsibilities and opportunities, a biographer must deal with actualities—not probabilities. Surprise is an important biographical asset. A biography which tells the reader nothing more than was already known is a dull affair. The public want new facts or a new point of view. Mr. Strachey is a prince amongst biographers because, apart from his masterly style, he displays his victims in a new light. He may be right or wrong, but he is always entertaining.

The most attractive biographies are those which enable the subject to reveal himself through the medium of conversations written at the time. Boswell became immortal because he kept a diary, and knew what to record and what to reproduce. Lord Morley's voluminous " Life of Gladstone " contains many notable things, but the most interesting chapter is that in which he records Mr. Gladstone's " Table Talk." Letters are often dull reading, but sometimes

they, too, disclose the man. "The Heart of Gambetta," containing his love-letters, is a remarkable example. It gives the key not only to his character, but to the conditions under which he lived and worked. Mr. Gladstone left behind him between 200,000 and 300,000 written papers of one sort and another. He seldom displayed himself in his vast correspondence, whereas in conversation he was natural, frank, and self-revealing. As a rule, the public are more interested in what the man was than in what he did. His doings are usually public property. The reader wants to know what sort of man it was who did them. That is the secret of public interest in the personalities of the great.

Most modern biographies are defective because the writers spend the greater part of their energies in describing the subject's deeds instead of the man. According to Mr. Poel the fault of English actors in the presentation of Shakespeare is over-emphasis, and particularly over-emphasis on the wrong words. This saying might well be applied to modern biography, which suffers from over-emphasis regarding well-known or comparatively trivial doings of the deceased, while too little attention is paid to the description of his personality. Years of preparation are required to produce a good biography. The biographer must mark down his victim, and stealthily stalk him to the grave with a constant eye on post-mortem possibilities. He must act as a Socratic midwife by putting questions likely to evoke revealing answers. But the victim must not be alarmed or

apprised of what is in store for his ghost, otherwise he would cease to be natural. A man is not likely to be himself if constantly confronted with his shroud. The victim must play unconscious of his fate. Few biographers have such opportunities, and those who have seldom make use of them. Efficient and regular diary-keeping is an arduous task. Autobiographies are usually more frank and more interesting than biographies. They have the real personal touch. The writer knows where he lies open to criticism, and usually supplies his explanation for what it is worth. On the contrary, the biographer often glides over or suppresses awkward incidents. The inimitable Pepys; Rousseau's "Confessions"; De Quincey's "Confessions"; Casanova's "Memoirs"; those of Benvenuto Cellini; and St. Augustine's "Confessions," are well-known examples of frank autobiographies, while the short record by Burns of his own life is a revealing document. The popularity of certain autobiographies once more raises the interesting question, "Why is it that the romantically immoral are always more interesting than the well-living and the good?" I shall not attempt to answer the question. I leave it to you.

Perhaps Mr. Bernard Shaw has supplied the answer. In his new play I see that Cain boasted that he was the first murderer, whereas Adam was only the first man. Cain says, "Anybody could be the first man! It is as easy as to be the first cabbage. To be the first murderer one must be a man of spirit." Great things are often done by dull people, but the

men of spirit are the real subjects for enthralling biography. Rousseau's introduction to his "Confessions" contains the heart of the matter and would be the finest advertisement for an autobiography ever written:

I am commencing an undertaking, hitherto without precedent, and which will never find an imitator. I desire to set before my fellows the likeness of a man in all the truth of nature, and that man myself.

Myself alone! I know the feelings of my heart, and I know men. I am not made like any of those I have seen; I venture to believe I am not made like any of those who are in existence. If I am not better, at least I am different. Whether Nature has acted wrongly or rightly in destroying the mould in which she cast me can only be decided after I have been read.

Let the trumpet of the Day of Judgment sound when it will, I will present myself before the Sovereign Judge with this book in my hand. I will say boldly: "This is what I have done, what I have thought, what I was. I have told the good and the bad with equal frankness. I have neither omitted anything bad, nor interpolated anything good. If I have occasionally made use of some immaterial embellishments, this has only been in order to fill a gap caused by lack of memory. I may have assumed the truth of that which I knew might have been true, never of that which I knew to be false. I have shown myself as I was; mean and contemptible, good, high-minded and sublime, according as I was one or the other. I have unveiled my inmost self, even as Thou hast seen it, O Eternal Being. Gather round me the countless host of my fellow-men; let them hear my confessions, lament for my unworthiness, and blush for my imperfections. Then let each of them in turn reveal, with the same frankness, the secrets of his heart at the foot of the Throne, and say, if he dare, 'I was better than that man!'"

Casanova tells us that a friend in giving him his autobiography warned him never to write his memoirs. Casanova asked why.

Because, in my intense desire to write the truth, I have made myself ridiculous. If ever you feel the same temptation, cast it from you, or, I can assure you, you will regret it ; as an honest man and a truthful historian, you will be obliged to conceal nothing, you must have no cowardly complaisances towards your own faults, you must castigate them mercilessly ; on the other hand, you must yourself point out the good you have done. You must praise and blame yourself on each page, and whereas all the ill that you say of yourself will be taken as gospel, all the good that you say will be put down to pride and vanity.

The question is often put, " What are the best biographies in English ? " Of course, every one agrees that Boswell stands first. Then there is a great blank. Lockhart's " Scott " ; Trevelyan's " Macaulay " ; Morley's " Gladstone " ; Morley's " Burke " ; Winston Churchill's life of his father ; Lord Rosebery's " Pitt " ; his little-known but admirable monograph on Lord Randolph Churchill ; Strachey's " Eminent Victorians " and " Life of Queen Victoria," are recognized masterpieces. Spedding's remarkable " Life of Bacon " in seven volumes is seldom read. Notwithstanding its length, it has many merits. The Bible is full of wonderful biographies, which are told briefly and with matchless skill, so that we know more about some of the persons described than about our own friends. The Biblical biographers had the art of picking out the incidents that showed the character of the man described. How well, for example, we know and understand the wily Jacob and his more wily mother ! Then many epitaphs in a few words tell the whole story. They are tabloid biographies. For example :

To the Memory of
John Smith.
"He overdid it."

According to Mr. Asquith, and most people agree with him, this would be a suitable epitaph for many modern biographers!

"EDUCATION FISHER"

In one of his speeches Mr. Ramsay MacDonald emphasized the importance of variety in mankind. Mr. H. A. L. Fisher is a rare and interesting specimen, a combination of learning and politics. One of Oxford's choicest flowers, he remained there until 1912, when, at the age of forty-seven, he became Vice-Chancellor of Sheffield University. Four years later he joined Mr. Lloyd George's Government as Minister of Education, in which capacity he achieved great distinction and was loaded with compliments by leading men of all parties. It is true that the Geddes Committee were critical, but their materialistic comments in no way dimmed the lustre of this brilliant educational star.

Temperamentally, Mr. Fisher is an idealist. That is to say, he conceives the possibility of a world in which pain and injustice will be reduced to a minimum by universal effort and goodwill. Being an historian by training, he is also a realist, oppressed by the unabated foolishness and wickedness of mankind. These conflicting traits are exemplified in his remarkable new book, "The Common Weal" (Clarendon Press, 7*s.* 6*d.* net), which contains a searching exam-

ination of the social system. Of patriotism, as generally understood, he is critical.

> It is a matter for careful consideration whether we have not now reached a stage of evolution in which it is necessary that our notions of patriotic duty should be revised, whether it is possible to maintain in full vigour the old exclusiveness, whether war has not become so great a menace to civilization that greater authority should be attached to such machinery as may be contrived for averting it; whether, in fact, we are not passing into a phase of history when the purely national aspect of civic duty will be felt to be insufficient, and will require more and more to be supplemented by wider conceptions.

On the other hand, he gives an alarming account of the fate of nations who, through negligence or an unwarranted reliance on the good faith of other countries, failed to " keep their powder dry." Apparently they all came to a tragic end. Mr. Fisher recognizes that disarmament must be general, and that if one nation leads the way by relying on words, theories, and good intentions, it will fall an easy prey to others who covet its possessions. This is bewildering.

Patriotism is the spring of national defence and national aspirations. If it be destroyed or diluted, the whole superstructure will collapse. It is more vigorous than ever in France, America, Italy, Japan, and the new countries created at Versailles to give effect to nationalistic feelings. There is a renaissance of patriotism even in poor, decimated, overrun China—" China for the Chinese " is the cry. Indeed, all these countries are making renewed efforts to retain their own markets by excluding foreign goods,

and America has gone so far as to exclude all but a specified number of immigrants per annum. How, therefore, can Britain afford to don a new fashion which, according to Mr. Fisher, would leave her at the mercy of other nations? How can any nation, under existing conditions, preserve its independence if it attenuates patriotism, the motive power on which its prosperity and defence depend? The experiment is too hazardous. As Lord Haldane remarked, "We want to be peaceful, but we want to be ready to protect ourselves against those who are not."

Happily patriotism and love of country are emotions unlikely to be affected by philosophers. As Mr. Fisher says, "The home of our fathers exerts a subtle spell and claims an unalterable loyalty." Views, by the way, hardly consistent with a revision of our notions of patriotism.

> From the lone shieling of the misty island
> Mountains divide us and the waste of seas,
> But still the blood is strong, the heart is Highland,
> And we in dreams behold the Hebrides.

Mr. Fisher is a fine descriptive writer, in the Biblical or Ciceronian style, producing his effects by stating in simple terms a collection of unadorned facts. Chapter I of "The Common Weal," portraying the defects of civilization and the dangers to which it is exposed, made my flesh creep. It begins with two sentences, one quoted and one original:

> "In spite of all the efforts of a philosophic age, the most civilized

empires will always be as near to barbarism as the most polished steel is to rust."

Nobody has any wide experience of life without being conscious of the generally low standard of human behaviour.

The author then sets out to establish these propositions by describing the world as it is. The result is disquieting and disheartening. The reader begins to doubt the progress of man and to wonder whether civilization may not stagger to its doom. But these depressing statements are only the prelude to a diagnosis of the disease and a prescription for its cure.

Mr. Fisher believes that the dangers are not economic but moral. He says we cannot hope for relief by changing the economic system—in other words, by substituting socialism for individualism. Mankind must cultivate its sense of social duty, which comprises all the virtues. In short, it must, if I may so put it, " rend its heart and not its garments." The mechanism of the world may be changed, but if the motives that impel it remain the same, the alteration will be apparent, not real. This is no new doctrine, although its significance tends to become obscured in a materialistic age. Experience proves that under all economic systems self-interest still remains the predominant human factor.

Prevention of war is the crying need of the age. Modern methods of destruction make the prospect too awful for serious contemplation. Mr. Fisher is a valiant supporter of the League of Nations, and every reasonable person must sympathize with him.

But here again it is the heart that matters. What the world wants is the will to peace. We are too apt in our island, unhappily no longer invulnerable, to interpret the views of other nations in terms of our own ideas. The Washington Conference showed that Anglo-Saxon ideas are not those of other races. Take, for example, the illuminating discussion on limitation of submarines. Even peace-loving America, far away from the armed camp of Europe, was not prepared to abandon extensive naval and military armaments. While the Conference was sitting the American Army Secretary made a speech setting forth the necessity for enlarged and improved *military* preparations. Mr. Fisher thinks that the ever-increasing community of nations, due to speedier transport, the telegraph, wireless, etc., will tend to peace. Let us hope he is right. Meanwhile, it is a proud thought that Britain is the chief peace missionary. At the same time, we must remember that even missionaries, if too trustful, are liable to have their trousers stolen. It is a melancholy thought!

The Proletarian State finds no favour with Mr. Fisher, who indicates its absurdities in trenchant fashion. Like Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, he insists upon the necessity for variety. A world consisting of mechanics and manual labourers would be just as ineffective as one peopled exclusively by professors, scientists, and professional men. People are continually passing from one class to another, and selfishness is by no means uncommon in dealings between

members of the same class where their interests happen to conflict. However, all sorts of curious things may be in store for us. Professor Haldane, the celebrated physiologist, prophesies that within half a century mankind may be able to determine the physical and mental attributes of its children—an alluring prospect for Mr. Sidney Webb and other Utopia-builders, who will then be able to prescribe the patterns. There is, of course, much to be said for this plan, but it would be a dull world.

Mr. Fisher is strong on intellectual thoroughness, which he regards as the overshadowing duty imposed on every citizen—the honest attempt to discriminate between the true and the false. The ordinary man's inability to ascertain facts far removed from his everyday experience, but necessary for an accurate judgment on political and economic theories, is, however, a serious obstacle. For instance, how can a sound judgment be formed on socialistic ideas without a knowledge of the intricacies of foreign trade, upon which we depend for our food, raw materials, etc.? And yet how difficult it is to obtain such information except by practical experience! Mr. Fisher himself emphasizes this when discussing the origins of the war. Even experts are not agreed. Intellectual thoroughness is no armour against the prejudice that surrounds most questions involving the emotions or self-interest. Bias is not confined to the illiterate. What the world really wants is a strong injection of the "Golden Rule."

I have said enough about Mr. Fisher's book. I will now say something more about Mr. Fisher. Unlike many learned men, he is an attractive conversationalist, able and willing to talk well on almost any subject. Few people have read so much, and fewer still have such a vivid recollection of what they have read. Although his interests are mostly serious, he has a keen sense of humour and delightful way of enlivening a dull subject by little flashes of wit. Perhaps this pleasing habit is due to the lively companionship of his brilliant wife, a lady of great attainments. Mr. Fisher is an orator of no mean order. His style is quiet, restrained, and convincing. As might be expected, every sentence is clearly cut and well formed, and the arguments built up with logical precision. A tall, spare, commanding figure and penetrating blue eyes give him a scholarly appearance, corresponding to his character, ideals, and mode of speech.

To understand a man you must examine his beginnings. Mr. Fisher began life as a professor, and, notwithstanding his political excursions, he still has the professorial point of view; the habit of looking at things through the eyes of books and scientific experiments. But, temperamentally, he is always on the side of the angels—always fighting for ideals and the improvement of mankind. Although shrewd and practical, he is not the sort of man to be placed in charge of a bacon factory. He is too aloof and might be too sympathetic with the pigs. His interest in porcine

psychology might interfere with the business. But the world cannot get on without its Fishers. They leaven the practical lump and elevate public life.

THE SOCIALIST PLAN FOR A NEW WORLD

The other day I received a circular giving reasons why I should purchase a series of books by Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb. One, "The History of Trade Unionism," I had already. The others I at once acquired, not only for the reasons stated in the circular, but because I understand that Mr. and Mrs. Webb are two of the chief exponents of the economic policy of the Labour Party. Obviously, it is the duty of every citizen to inform himself what that policy is likely to be. When he knows, he may agree or disagree, but the first step is knowledge. The most instructive volume of the series is "A Constitution for the Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain" (Longmans & Co., 12*s.* 6*d.*). Some readers may regard it as a Heaven-sent message, and others as a fantastic dream. It is not my purpose to offer an opinion. My object is to explain what Mr. and Mrs. Webb propose. Whether they are right or wrong, they have produced a brilliant and entertaining work.

As is well known, they are dissatisfied with the existing economic system and wish to supersede it by another, under which they allege that wealth would be more equally distributed. To achieve

this, vast changes are suggested, which may mean increased national prosperity or national ruin. The overwhelming importance of the subject is obvious. Mr. and Mrs. Webb explain that they alone are responsible for the suggestions, which are put forward for discussion only, and must not be taken to represent the considered policy of the Labour Party as a whole. The precise form of the new State has not yet been finally settled. It is still in the melting-pot. All the same, Mr. and Mrs. Webb's detailed proposals demand careful scrutiny and reflection.

The basic idea of their scheme is an old friend—the nationalization of the instruments of production. Mr. and Mrs. Webb describe the process in detail. They emphasize that nationalization does not mean the bare ownership of land, buildings, plant, and raw materials, but the power of deciding to what use the instruments of production should be put and to what end each productive process should be directed (p. 164). In other words, as hereafter explained, manufactures and commerce are to be controlled primarily from Westminster by committees. Mr. and Mrs. Webb do not favour decentralization. Nor do they favour the "self-governing workshop."

> The relationship set up between a manager who has to give orders all day to his staff, and the members of the staff, who, sitting as a committee of management, criticize his action in the evening, with the power of dismissing him if he fails to conform to their wishes, has been found by experience to be an impossible one.

The "democratic theory" does not require that

"the clerks, accountants, office-boys, and charwomen" should elect the executive council and general secretary of a trade union whose orders the office staff has to obey, or that every Local Education Authority should be elected by "a heterogeneous staff of teachers, inspectors, school-keepers, attendance officers, doctors, and nurses," or that the Postmaster-General should be made responsible to "the varied mass of postal employees whose function involves their obedience to the head of the hierarchy," or that "the clerks and messengers of the Foreign Office" should elect the Foreign Minister and control his policy (p. 159).

Nor do Mr. and Mrs. Webb favour control by consumers. The national railways could hardly be governed by the votes of "the incoherent mob of passengers who pour out of the termini of our great cities." Mr. and Mrs. Webb contend that government of the people by the people for the people means government by elected representatives whose powers must be of the most far-reaching and absolute description. This plan is to be carried out by a drastic change in the constitution. For ornamental and ceremonial purposes there would be an hereditary monarch, as "there seem to be insuperable difficulties in providing for an elective headship." But they say "unless the Court can acquire better manners and a new sense of social values, it may be expected that the institution of monarchy, whatever its political advantages, will become unpopular, and very quickly disappear, probably by the voluntary resignation

of the holder of the office for the time being." The Heir Apparent would be trained "under the direction of the Cabinet."

There would be two Parliaments, each with an equal number of whole-time, paid members, but not necessarily elected for the same geographical areas, on the same day, for the same term, or by the same method of voting. The one, to be called the "Political Parliament," would be charged with the conduct of Foreign and Overseas affairs, the Navy, Army, and Police, and the administration of justice. The other, to be called the "Social Parliament," would be entrusted with the control of taxation, the nation's economic resources, trade, industry, public health, and education. The functions of each House would be clearly defined, and the aid of the Law Courts might be invoked should either Parliament act *ultra vires*. The idea is a system of mutual check to curtail "Parliamentary omnipotence." If the Social Parliament "desire to prohibit private enterprise or penalize individual action, it must seek the concurrence of the other body."

Any strike of national employees, of whom, as Mr. and Mrs. Webb point out, there might be some millions under the new regime, would not be a strike against the Political Parliament responsible for law and order, and wielding the instrument of the standing Army and Police, but against its Social brother and its subordinate bodies. If the Political Parliament sided with the strikers, apparently the Social Parliament would be stranded, whereas if the two

bodies were agreed, the Social Parliament would have the support of the Army and Police. This might not, however, be conclusive. Mr. and Mrs. Webb say (p. 298):

> In the Socialist Commonwealth the legitimate retort to "direct action" is "direct action." Should the miners refuse to hew coal, the other crafts, if after reports from all concerned and widespread publicity they think the miners unreasonable, will refuse to supply them with spirits, beer, picture-palaces, and tobacco.

Consequently similar tactics might be adopted by disgruntled national employees when dealing with unsympathetic Parliaments or unfriendly soldiers or police. Before describing the Social Parliament's machinery for the management and control of industry, it is necessary to explain the forms of industrialism under the new system. Mr. and Mrs. Webb anticipate that the change would be gradual, and the period of transition probably "disheartening." To begin with, land, buildings, plant, machinery, railways, collieries, banks, insurance companies, gas, water, and electric light works, would be acquired by the State, who would carry on the seven last-named by machinery about to be mentioned. Municipal and co-operative enterprise would be stimulated, and when desirable buildings and plant would be leased to municipalities and co-operative societies. In other cases similar leases might be granted to private firms or companies.

Mr. and Mrs. Webb strongly favour the co-operative movement, but point out that the 200,000 employees of the co-operative societies work under

much the same conditions as those of other concerns. The difficulty is to secure efficiency without autocracy. They consider that to achieve the object in view the management must be supreme in all organizations, but seem to think that managers who have risen from the ranks and are not too highly paid are likely to display more consideration for subordinates. Under the new system there would be, as Mr. and Mrs. Webb observe, three separate forms of industrialism: (1) Nationalized industries. (2) Co-operative and municipalized industries. (3) Those carried on for individual profit.

No property would be confiscated. Every one would be fully compensated, either by Government Bonds, annuities, or payments in cash, but the recipients would be paid exclusively by a tax on property ownership, *i.e.*, out of their own pockets. How this arrangement differs from confiscation is not explained, but perhaps Mr. and Mrs. Webb's intentions are not clearly expressed. Private property will not be prohibited, subject to the limitation that no one will be allowed to own "the instruments of production" (not clearly defined). Indeed, the accumulation of private hoards will be encouraged.

It is assumed that these may take three forms: 1st, homes, personal paraphernalia, tools, and apparatus for individual use; 2nd, life insurance; and 3rd, "the simple accumulation of deposits in the national and municipal banks," on which interest will be paid if thought desirable. The wage and currency systems are to be continued, also the system of taxation,

but fortunes up to £5,000 or even £10,000 will be only lightly taxed. Anything beyond such a sum would be prevented by death duties. Professional men—lawyers, doctors, authors, etc.—would continue their avocations for their own unrestricted benefit as at present.

We now come to the machinery to be adopted by the Social Parliament for the conduct of trade and industry. It is suggested that this part of its work "would apparently best be done" by Standing Committees on the model of the London County Council and the great municipalities (p. 119), but "the various Chairmen need not necessarily agree with each other in policy or accept any responsibility for the work of other Committees than their own." The Social Parliament would appoint a National Board, to manage each industry for a specified term of years, each Board to consist of sixteen members —five representing the principal branches of the administration, five the various vocations employed (manual working and clerical), and five the consumers and community as a whole; the principal executive officer being President (p. 177).

The National Board would appoint a District Council, constituted in the same manner, and the District Council would appoint a Works Committee "chosen by all the various sections and grades of workers in the establishment, or other convenient unit." The sphere of the Committee would be primarily the discussion of grievances and the making of suggestions. Appointments and promotions "for

positions of management and direction or as technicians of any kind" would be made by Standing Appointments Boards or Selection Committees. First appointments to the clerical service would be made on the results of open competitive examination, but in recruiting the staff for manual working occupations boys and girls might be selected by special appointment officers, "aided by the Council of Juvenile Advisory Committees connected with the schools."

Disciplinary questions would be settled by Discipline Boards, "high or low, great or small, according to the circumstances," half the members representing the element of management and half the wage-earners. Apparently this system would in the first instance be restricted to the seven branches of industry, railways, coal-mines, and so on, enumerated above. But Mr. and Mrs. Webb place much reliance upon investigations, statistics, and suggestions. Therefore there would be a Control Board or Boards (when the New World comes I shall make a dash to get on to one of these!) who would sit from day to day, investigating, auditing, criticizing, and suggesting for the benefit of the executive. It seems that the activities of these bodies would extend to industry as a whole, because Mr. and Mrs. Webb are firmly convinced that our present trade and manufacturing methods are wasteful and inept in the extreme, chiefly due to lack of ordered knowledge and statistics.

Under the new regime there would be no trade secrets. Everything would be published to the world.

All trade and technical knowledge would be "universalized." Mr. and Mrs. Webb say there will always remain the profit involved in priority for the benefit of the ingenious inventor of some improvement in organization, or the genius of a manager who has a new idea, or the discoverer of some new market or application. It is the past half-year's work that the auditor and the cost accountant will report upon.

The energetic and ambitious manager, even if his best achievements are revealed to an admiring world, and even if he cannot be allowed to monopolize his ideas for the future, has always to-day in which to work for his own gain.

The capitalist *entrepreneur* or manager will have to become, in effect, a strictly regulated intellectual piece-worker, remunerated according to results ascertained by accurate scientific measurement (pp. 331–2).

Local government is to be reorganized.

Municipal enterprise has, in our degradation, come to mean little more than rescuing our own neighbourhood from the material and moral defilement and pollution to which Capitalism has condemned it (p. 207).

To remedy this state of affairs and other evils, the country is to be divided into wards, so that "the delicate and highly differentiated complex of public services can be best co-ordinated." The object would be "to constitute everywhere a self-conscious unit, which might comprise something like a couple of thousand families in the country, and twice or thrice that number in large cities." Each ward would be governed by an elected, whole-time, paid Councillor or Councillors, but Mr. and Mrs. Webb "look to see voluntary organizations of the consumers or users of particular municipal services—

such as the parents of the children in the schools, the members of the football or cricket clubs using the municipal playing-fields, the readers who habitually make use of the municipal libraries, the regular attendants at the municipal concerts, the frequenters of the municipal tramcars—bringing to bear on the Executive Committee concerned their suggestions and complaints, and being officially recognized as Advisory Committees " (p. 230).

Indeed, Mr. and Mrs. Webb place great reliance on the Committee system and strongly resent imputations made on its efficiency. Also they do not share the general view regarding the wastefulness of production during the war. On the contrary, they say that the Government succeeded largely in convincing the business world that prices could be reduced and production increased by the application of methods summed up in the sacred word " co-ordination," which became so familiar during the war. Views will differ whether the business world was " largely convinced."

One important item in the new policy remains to be mentioned, viz., " the ' national minimum ' of subsistence and leisure for the time being prescribed by the Social Parliament . . . for every worker, however defenceless." But Mr. and Mrs. Webb do not explain how this is to be provided, although they point out the difficulties which may occur if all nations do not adopt the same plan (p. 323). To the important subject of export trade, from which, by way of exchange of commodities and services, the

nation derives the bulk of its food and raw materials, Mr. and Mrs. Webb devote only two pages out of a total of three hundred and fifty-six. They look forward to the time " when the export trade of the world . . . will have been transformed into reciprocal exchange of imports conducted by the paid agents of the consumers and citizens. . . . In a world in which all industry was socialized all speculative exporting for private profit would cease. In its stead there would be reciprocal imports organized by democracies of consumers for use instead of exchange . . . the whole world would become one vast network of associations of consumers."

But meanwhile Mr. and Mrs. Webb contemplate that export trade " will remain longest within the sphere of the private capitalist subject to whatever conditions of control and taxation the community may find it expedient to impose." This seems to require elucidation, as our national existence depends on the satisfactory continuance of our export trade.

To sum up, Mr. and Mrs. Webb indict the existing system on two grounds—(1) inefficiency and wastefulness; (2) economic injustice. They propose to remedy (1) by transferring the control of industry from " business men," wishing for profits, to elected representatives with supreme powers. They look to realize their ideal not by change in ownership alone. That will be necessary, but only to give effect to their wider purpose. They show that the choice lies between two different types of organization for the management of industry and commerce. Their sug-

gestions regarding (2) are not equally clear. I do not understand from their book the destination of "the profits of industry," viz., whether these are to be absorbed by the wage-earners in the particular trade; whether they are to go to the Government in relief of taxation; or whether they are to pass to the consumer. For example: If coal-mines were nationalized, would the shilling a ton, or whatever profit the coal-owners now make, go to the miners, to the Government, or be used to reduce the price of coal.

I cannot do better than conclude by quoting a sagacious observation of Mr. and Mrs. Webb: What is no less needed than a greater knowledge of things is the greater knowledge of human nature.

THE TRUTH ABOUT VENIZELOS

The retirement of Venizelos is an important event in European politics and a suitable occasion to describe the career and character of this extraordinary person. When describing Mr. Fisher I remarked that to understand a man you must consider his beginnings. In the case of Venizelos they are specially significant. His appearance gives no indication of the turbulence of his earlier life. Except for his skull-cap, he looks much the same as other people. There is nothing to show that for forty-five years he lived in a country where politicians are apt to have short shrift. Throughout its history—and it is a long one—Crete, his native place, has been the home of civil wars, insurrections, revolutions, massacres, and assassinations. Between 1850 and 1906 there were some thirty revolutions. Venizelos became a member of the Cretan Assembly in 1887, at the age of twenty-three.

During the succeeding twenty-two years he was constantly engaged in revolutions and his life was continually in danger. He was probably undisturbed. Habit is second nature. His family had been revolutionaries for generations. Indeed, most Cretans were revolutionaries. Revolution and sudden death were

the custom of the country. The Christians massacred the Mussulmans and the Mussulmans returned the compliment with interest. The Turks occasionally demonstrated their authority by force of arms, and, to add spice to the proceedings, "the Powers" now and then bombarded Crete to show its 250,000 inhabitants that they could not do as they liked. No wonder that when Venizelos was born two Mohammedan hoodjahs and two Greek priests prayed unceasingly—each in a different language—for two days and two nights outside the room where the birth was taking place, with the object of securing a long life for the child.

From the first, Venizelos's political aims were clear and definite, and he pursued them with unswerving energy, courage, and pertinacity. His first purpose was to free Crete from the Turks, who had held it from 1645, and to join the island to the kingdom of Greece. In this he succeeded after twenty years' agitation. Then he started a new career in which he pursued his second object—viz., "to raise Greece morally and materially to the level of other modern States and to make her the greatest factor in civilization and progress in the East." In 1909 the Greek army rose and demanded a reformed Government. Whether the rising was stimulated by Venizelos is not clear. His enemies say it was. If they are right, the reply may be made that the revolutionaries voiced the views of the Greek people. In 1910 Venizelos said farewell to Crete and, at the invitation of the Military League, went to Athens, where he became Prime Minister

with almost plenary powers. At this time he was designated "the saviour of modern Greece." Truly a romantic situation! At the age of forty-six, having freed Crete from Turkish rule, or misrule, he was setting out to establish a new Greek, or rather Hellenic, Empire. (Hellas was the old name for Greece.) What a past, and what a prospect!

Then followed five brilliant years. Greece was reorganized and revitalized. Notwithstanding immense difficulties, the Balkan League was established, comprising Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia, and Montenegro. Two successful wars were waged—one between the League and Turkey, and the other between Greece and Bulgaria. As a result Hellenic territory was nearly doubled by the addition of Macedonia and certain islands. These great services not only made Venizelos a popular hero in his own country, but established his fame throughout Europe. No other statesman since Bismarck had formed such a great conception and given effect to it. When the war came, Venizelos, who was Prime Minister, urged with true insight that Greece should join the Allies. As stated in his letter to King Constantine of January, 1915, "not only in order to perform a moral duty, but in exchange for compensations which, when realized, would make Greece great and powerful to a degree that the greatest optimists could not have contemplated a few years ago." The King thought otherwise, and insisted on neutrality. Venizelos therefore resigned. At the next election, however, he was returned with an overwhelming majority and

again became Premier. He urged co-operation with the Allies, and again resigned, owing to differences with Constantine. He then established a Committee of National Defence in Salonika and formed an army to support the Allied forces. When Constantine was deposed by the Allies, Venizelos resumed control, appointed Constantine's second son as his father's successor, and Greece entered the war. At the Peace Conference (Paris) he was one of the dominating figures, much in favour with Clemenceau, Lloyd George, and President Wilson, who were grateful for the services he had rendered, the dangers he had incurred, and the sacrifices he had made in the Allied cause. Clemenceau admired him for his courage, patriotism, and bold conceptions; Lloyd George admired him for the same reasons and as a successful revolutionary reared in a small mountainous country similar to his own native land; President Wilson admired him as the pure milk of idealism, suitably flavoured with the essence of national self-interest. Now comes the tragedy. True to his policy, Venizelos insisted upon the large share of the Turkish spoils —in effect the greater part of Thrace, Smyrna with a part of the hinterland, Imbros, and other islands, which he had been promised more or less as a recompense to Greece for supporting the Allies. After much delay these claims were granted. Meanwhile, Marshal Foch and Sir Henry Wilson had advised at the San Remo Conference that the proposed division of Turkish territories could be enforced only by employing a certain number of troops, which the

Supreme Council were not prepared to furnish. Venizelos then made the mistake of his life—a mistake that will rank amongst the great blunders of history. He offered to enforce the Treaty. The British members of the Supreme Council were delighted, the French doubtful, and the Italians hostile, but unhappily the offer was accepted. More nations suffer from territorial indigestion than from territorial starvation. In common parlance, Greece bit off more than she could chew.

After the momentous meeting at San Remo, Marshal Foch told me he foresaw "an immense debacle." Sir Henry Wilson said the same. Notwithstanding, matters took their course. The British Mission, at any rate, had full confidence in the Cretan wizard who had planned and accomplished such miracles in the past. The melancholy sequel is well known. The action of the Greeks gave a fresh impetus to Turkish nationalism, and although the invading army was at first successful, it was annihilated by the Turks in September, 1922. Meanwhile Venizelos had been ousted at the Greek elections in November, 1920, and Constantine reinstated. The results of the later developments of Venizelos's policy were disastrous. Greece was ruined financially; a million Greeks became homeless refugees; Turkish trade was suspended and an enormous amount of property destroyed; Britain's relations with her Eastern subjects were disturbed, and, in short, the whole trend of events in the East was changed. This is a serious indictment, but it must be remembered

that, had Venizelos retained power, results might have been different. Whatever its initial weaknesses, robbed of its main-spring the Greek offensive was bound to fail. Horrible events followed in Greece in the shape of wholesale executions of leading men. King Constantine abdicated, and eventually Venizelos was recalled to rescue his much-distressed country from ruin. But, as the hymn says:

> Time, like an ever-rolling stream,
> Bears all its sons away.

Now, owing to ill-health, Venizelos has been compelled to relinquish his political career. Thus one more of the great figures at the Peace Conference disappears from the active list. Clemenceau, Venizelos, and Borden have retired; General Botha, Sir Henry Wilson, Mr. Bonar Law, and President Wilson are dead; Lloyd George, Poincaré, General Smuts, Hughes of Australia, and Orlando are out of office.

Like most great agitators, in private life M. Venizelos has quiet manners and a gentle voice. He is not communicative about his plans and doings, and knows how to keep reporters at bay, while at the same time impressing them with the romantic side of his personality—a rare art. A lawyer by profession and training, he is a subtle dialectician as well as a man of action. His letters and dispatches are well worth reading.

In appearance he is of medium height, spare and well made, with a closely cropped whitish beard. His highly polished bald head and massive brow are striking features, usually accentuated by his skull-

cap. In some respects he is the most remarkable statesman of recent years—the only one who started out with a definite plan which he pursued with unremitting zeal. Had his schemes matured, he would have gone down to history with a wonderful record. As it is, under the Treaty of Lausanne, Greece has been given Western Thrace and other territory; so that, having regard to this and his previous achievements, Venizelos may still have a great name as a maker of modern Greece, but with a good many notes of interrogation added.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Venizelos," by Kerofilas (John Murray). A panegyric.
"Greece and the Allies," by G. F. Abbott (Methuen). A bitter criticism.
"The Eastern Question," by Marriott (Clarendon Press).
"Great European Treaties of Nineteenth Century," by Oakes and Mowat (Clarendon Press).
"Cradle of the War," by Woods (Clarendon Press).

DIVIDING THE SPOILS

This highly controversial subject continues to induce a large quantity of literature. The latest recruit is Mr. St. Loe Strachey, the famous Editor of the *Spectator* ("Economics of the Hour." Hodder and Stoughton, 7*s.* 6*d.*). As might be expected, the book is informative and urbane, without being wildly exciting. Except on rare occasions, as already pointed out in *John o' London's Weekly*, the readers of the *Spectator* do not like excitement. The *Spectator's* success is due in no small measure to Mr. Strachey's appreciation of the mental attitude of the bankers, clergymen, lawyers, doctors, business men, and professors who form his clientele. This book, however, is dedicated, not to the readers of the *Spectator*, but to the "Working Mothers of England."

Whether these wonderful women, who have done, and are doing, more for the world than they understand, have the same point of view as the readers of the *Spectator* is a matter for doubt. Mr. Strachey tells us nothing new, but puts the facts in a pleasing fashion. The whole case might be told, it is true, in a short, meaty pamphlet, but I am not sure that working mothers, at any rate, are in favour of tabloids. No doubt they are more appreciative of discursive

writing which does not demand too heavy and continuous strain after the day's work. But here we are faced with the problem whether the working mothers of England will be prepared to pay seven shillings and sixpence for Mr. Strachey's or any other book on economics. But " Economics of the Hour " is sure to be widely read by his many admirers.

Briefly and broadly, Mr. Strachey says that economic prosperity depends upon production, and that if we do not produce, we cannot consume. This apparently self-evident proposition has been frequently stated, but Mr. Strachey repeats it in a pleasing and forcible way. He is not, however, as emphatic as he might be when explaining the chief reason for confused thought on this point. Economics are made mysterious and complicated by what I may call " symbolism." Money is a symbol which diverts attention from realities. In one of M. Clemenceau's short stories, he tells of a Jew who loved money, not for what it would bring, but because it was so romantic and mysterious. As he looked at his hoard, representing the currencies of different countries, he loved to think that it represented and controlled the doings of millions of human beings.

Money obscures the effect of the accumulation and division of fractions. Take the coal trade, for example. Supposing that the colliers' share of coal was placed in one heap and the employers' in another. The former would be a mountain and the latter a molehill. But when the mountain came to be divided each collier's share of the mountain would be

very much smaller than each employer's share of the molehill. Perhaps if the colliers saw mountain and molehill side by side, they would be more satisfied than when they see the molehill resolved into £ s. d. in the employers' balance-sheet at the end of the year. I do not say they would, but there is no doubt that symbolism increases the sense of injustice, the root of so much dissatisfaction concerning the division of the spoils. The division is often criticized, not because the critics think they can get much more for themselves, but because they regard it as unfair that a few people should have so much in comparison.

Some time ago, at a public meeting at which reference was made to Mr. Ford's alleged income of £20,000,000 per annum, I suggested that his affluence was not regarded with unmitigated satisfaction by mankind, many of whom wondered whether one Mr. Ford, invaluable and deserving as he might be, was worth to the world as much as, say, 40,000 sea-captains, 70,000 engine-drivers, or 500,000 domestic servants. I threw out the casual suggestion that Mr. Ford might well increase the already high wages of his men or decrease the price of his motor-cars. This led to a letter from a clever captain of industry, who pointed out that either or both courses would tend to ruin the rest of the motor manufacturers and to increase Mr. Ford's monopoly. The force of this criticism is obvious and tends to show once more the complications of this difficult subject. In reply I told him the story of the Bishop who was staying at a country house. The small daughter of the family

was much interested in his quaint apparel. Wishing to divert the conversation to a higher level, the Bishop said to the child, "Do you know the Lord's Prayer?" "Yes," she said. Then he asked, "Do you know the Ten Commandments?" "Yes," she said. Then he inquired, "Do you know the Creed?" "Yes," she said. Then he asked her whether she knew her catechism. "Damn it all," said the little girl, "I'm only seven!"

One cannot know everything. Even Mr. Strachey is subject to this reflection. For example, he says, "Capital is simply wealth accumulated and applied to industry, *i.e.*, savings." He neglects to mention that under the joint-stock system capital can be created by a stroke of the pen and thus become a more or less permanent burden upon industry. On the whole, the joint-stock system may have been beneficial in helping to develop the resources of the world, but it has its defects. Again, Mr. Strachey remarks, "There never was, in truth, a more absurd statement than that of the poet who talked of the land where

'Wealth accumulates and men decay.'

The land where wealth accumulates is the land where men do not decay."

Mr. Strachey hardly does justice to Oliver Goldsmith, who was declaiming against the extinction of the peasantry by the incursions of the rich from abroad. Whether the poet was right in his facts is immaterial. His argument was sound, as no doubt Mr. Strachey would be one of the first to admit,

being himself a strong exponent of a numerous and well-nurtured agricultural population.

> . . . the man of wealth and pride
> Takes up a space that many poor supply'd;
> Space for his lake, his park's extended bounds,
> Space for his horses, equipage and hounds.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
> When once destroy'd, can never be supply'd.

This we know to our cost.

Mr. Strachey is a perfervid antagonist of restricted production, either by employer or employed. His motto is "Bounteous plenty." He is equally averse to a restricted labour market. Theoretically he may be correct, but from a practical point of view it may be noted that a class is rarely prepared to sacrifice its immediate interests to secure future gains which, according to theorists, are certain to accrue to the community as a whole. There are many striking examples of this. The American immigration law is one, and the restricted output of the tea and rubber manufacturers to counteract prices which were lower than the cost of production are others of a different sort. Mr. Strachey quotes interesting figures from Professor Bowlby's "Division of the Product of Industry" (Clarendon Press) regarding the national income and the way in which it is divided, but he does not point out the amazing fact that national taxation to-day amounts to no less than £900,000,000 per annum or thereabouts, and local taxation to about £200,000,000, while our exports in 1921 amounted to £700,000,000 only. Comment is needless. No

doubt we get good value for a great part of this huge sum of £1,100,000,000, but nevertheless the State and municipalities lay a heavy toll on industry, far exceeding the 10 per cent. collected by the Levites of old.

Mr. Strachey does not comment upon Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb's elaborate industrial scheme. As then pointed out, the prophets of the new world do not propose an equal division of the products of industry. There are still to be grades, and apparently each class of worker will be entitled to demand a revaluation of human effort. Reforms are to be effected and production increased and cheapened by eliminating captains of industry and substituting committees appointed by a special House of Parliament elected by popular vote. Indeed, Mr. and Mrs. Webb's chief complaint is that the world is badly run, and that it would be better managed under the committee system. Both they and Mr. Strachey agree that bounteous production is the essential of economic prosperity, but they hold widely divergent views as to the methods by which this is to be achieved. Meanwhile, we may again note that, despite theorists of all types, every class is busily engaged in fencing off its sphere of action and in endeavouring to improve its remuneration and conditions of work. This remark applies to employers and employed and to the professional classes. Wherever we look we see the same thing happening. Improved organization seems to have made the group mind more selfish and more insistent. When all is said, industrial

goodwill chiefly depends upon the heart and the point of view. We may at least congratulate ourselves that the different classes appreciate each other's point of view better than they did.

To-day the chief difficulty is that there are so few spoils to divide. Perhaps for the first time the country is beginning to realize our dependence, not only on foreign trade, but on things like the American cotton crop. The production of cotton in America has fallen since 1904 no less than 20 per cent. owing to the ravages of an industrious insect called the Boll Weevil, of which few people in this country have heard. Cotton goods form one-fourth of our export trade. If we cannot get cheap cotton, every one in the country suffers directly or indirectly.

HOW THE CHINESE DRAGON LOST HER TAIL

When listening to long discussions at the Washington Conference on the Chinese question, sometimes I used to wonder whether my fellow-countrymen appreciate what China means to Britain. For instance, it is difficult to realize that the prosperity of Lancashire depends upon the Chinese demand for trousers. It is a sad but true reflection that if every Chinaman were to order an extra pair each year, that would do more to solve our economic problems than even Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb's schemes for a new world. We are apt to forget that the population of China is 340,000,000. Just think of the amount of cloth required to make 160,000,000 pairs of trousers, to say nothing of other garments in due proportion

Unhappily, the prospects of such a sartorial revolution are not hopeful, but all the same China offers a pregnant field for trade. America, in her eager pursuit of foreign markets, has long perceived Chinese possibilities. This was one of the chief reasons for the Washington Conference. During the war, the American Government, at the solicitation of a group of American bankers, insisted upon participation in the Chinese consortium, an arrangement between Britain,

France, and Japan regarding the issue of Chinese loans. The Washington Conference was a move in the same direction. It was a friendly gesture to the Chinese, and a step in the development of American trading and financial aspirations, which are also being realized by the education in American schools and colleges of large numbers of Chinese students.

I am not, however, prompted by my experiences at Washington, but by an exhaustive treatise on Chinese trade, history, geography, religion, population, railways, treaties, flora, fauna, education, finance, etc., called the "China Year Book," 1923. It is edited by Mr. Woodhead, Editor of the *Peking and Tientsin Times*, and a correspondent of the *Morning Post*. The book is a remarkable production. First, it is a monument of editorial industry. There are twelve hundred pages, closely packed with information. And, second, it is a typographical wonder, having been admirably printed by Chinese printers who know little or no English and work from sight only. The Chinese, by the way, claim to have used movable types 500 years before Gutenberg cut his matrices at Mainz. It is useless to allege that the "Year Book" is light reading. It is not, and the Editor did not plan that it should be. Primarily it is a book of reference, but I have enjoyed looking through it.

Since the Revolution in 1911, when the Manchu Emperor, representative of a dynasty who had ruled China for nearly three hundred years, abdicated in favour of a Republic, China, with its vast territory,

estimated at four and a half million square miles, has drifted into political and financial chaos. The terms of the abdication were characteristically Chinese. The Emperor resigned because " the Empire seethed like a burning cauldron and the people were plunged in utter misery. As Heaven creates people and makes for them a Monarch, how dare we make them suffer from hostility for the sake of preserving the comfort and security of our one single family ? " (" Modern China," by S. G. Cheng, Oxford University Press—in parts interesting). An elaborate Constitution was drawn up for the new Republic providing for a President, and a Senate and House of Representatives to be elected under a highly complicated system. The reformers were deeply imbued with the teachings of John Stuart Mill, Lord Bryce, and other eminent constitutionalists—English, French, and American. The new Republican Constitution was an elaborate attempt to put into practice a selection of these theories. But subsequent events have been disheartening. The authors of the scheme appear to have overlooked the size of China as compared with Britain and America, and the indifference of the people to political affairs.

Several pages of the " Year Book " and " Modern China " are occupied in describing the minor revolutions, plots, counter-plots, civil wars, mutinies, and unscrupulous acts on the part of politicians and military adventurers which have occurred since 1912. To-day China has no Central Government worth speaking of. The Senate and House of Representa-

tives are a farce, and it remains to be seen whether such a huge nation containing so large a proportion of illiterates is capable of representative government. Luckily, the individual lives of the Chinese have not been seriously affected. The unit is the family, and the millions of Chinese families go on working and striving from day to day, Government or no Government. The Chinaman knows that you cannot live on ideas. Work is a necessity, and he works.

Therefore, although he takes little interest in what we should call "public affairs," he is a useful and effective citizen, and his steadiness, continuity, and industry preserve social stability, notwithstanding the decay of the Government. Since 1911 China has been almost continuously racked by civil war and internal dissensions, but the gross value of her foreign trade nearly doubled between 1911 and 1921. The increase has been mainly in imports. There has been a greatly increased demand for foreign machinery, and the import of electrical plant in 1921 was more than ten times that in 1911. Factories equipped with modern machinery have been springing up all over the country, and, owing to new markets opened up during the war, Chinese exports of raw material and manufactured goods have largely increased. The country is covered by a network of telegraphs, and railways and postal communications have been developed. Furthermore, there are thousands of local newspapers which more or less accurately supply current news.

Unhappily, this extension of commerce has been

accompanied by a decline in commercial morality. To-day Chinese business men are not so scrupulous as formerly in performing contracts which prove onerous. But it is only fair to say that violent fluctuations in prices and exchange have put a severe strain upon the Chinese merchants and have led them to repudiate or neglect obligations, thus bringing ruin to many European firms. There is strong nationalistic feeling amongst the Chinese, and particularly amongst the educated classes. Those who are concerned in the New Culture and Students' movements respectively, which are having such marked effects upon China, are deeply interested in Chinese relations with Foreign Powers and in European literature and methods. The Students' demonstrations against the transfer by the Versailles Conference to Japan of the German rights in Tsingtao and the boycott of Japanese commodities are evidences of the nationalistic feeling that prevails.

The New Culture movement aims at destroying the Chinese reverence for tradition and making Chinese literature a medium for expressing living ideas. As a result of this movement, the frock-coat and tall-hat are rapidly replacing the gorgeous robes of the official classes. A new and highly graded system of national education has been planned. The language has been standardized so as to make the best use of colloquial Chinese, and a new alphabet has been constructed containing forty symbols representing the various sounds in the standardized national language. But

these schemes have been crippled by the prevailing political and financial chaos.

The future of this great people is shrouded in obscurity. One thing, however, seems certain. China is slowly becoming Europeanized and Americanized. For philosophers this movement raises interesting questions. Is the change advantageous to the Chinese ? What is progress ? Is restlessness better than contentment ? The Chinese may buy more trousers, cinemas, kodaks, oil, patent medicines, etc., but will they be any better for the change in their habits and point of view ? In short, is Chicago an improvement on Peking ? I wonder ! Unfortunately, these are merely academic queries. The world has an inevitable trend. The crude and energetic usually oust the peaceful and unaggressive. The immediate object of the Anglo-American campaign in China is trade, but there is also the underlying assumption that Anglo-Saxon ways are superior to Chinese ways. Few of the eager, energetic politicians and business men who are bent upon improving China have any doubts about this.

China has many armies spread over the different provinces. These are used by their chiefs for their own purposes and are useless for national defence. They eat up vast sums of money, and the Washington Conference passed a resolution urging that reforms should be instituted in this respect without delay. So far nothing has been done. The Chinese Navy has ceased to exist for practical purposes. Her biggest man-of-war is a twenty-years-old unarmed

cruiser. That is why the Chinese Dragon lost her tail in the shape of valuable territory and valuable rights. Owing to the incapacity of her Government and the weakness of her naval and military forms, she has been an easy prey for every covetous marauder. Inadvertently she has tried the interesting experiment proposed by Mr. Williams, President of the Trade Union Congress. She has gone unarmed and has left her tail behind her. To-day her national unity is only preserved by the British and American navies.

Needless to say, that, in protecting China, Britain and America are not unmindful of their own interests. This is exemplified by a characteristic note to the Chinese Government by President Wilson, who remarked that the United States was " deeply interested in the maintenance by China of a Central United and alone responsible Government," and expressed " the very sincere hope that China, in her own interest and in that of the world, would immediately set aside her factional disputes, and that all parties and persons would work for the re-establishment of a co-ordinate Government and the assumption of that place among the Powers of the world to which China was so justly entitled, but the full attainment of which is impossible in the midst of internal discord."

The value of such admonitions, however, seems doubtful. For instance, Count Confucius, direct descendant of the Confucius who lived 550–478 B.C., is a cultured Chinese gentleman who lives in the interior of China. When he visited Peking after the

war, some one asked him what he thought of President Wilson. The Count replied: "I am sorry. I cannot say. His name is unknown to me."

No people are more tolerant of religious opinion than the Chinese. Indeed, Mr. Cheng alleges that there is no record in Chinese history of religious persecution. He says that missionaries have been massacred, not for religious reasons, but because they were interfering foreigners. The duties assigned to the new Ministry of the Interior, are indicative of the broad-minded views of the Chinese. The Ministry is charged with the duty of maintaining all temples and memorials dedicated to Heaven, to gods, to Confucius and other notabilities. It is also entrusted with the task of encouraging those distinguished for chivalry, chastity, or kindred virtues, and also centenarians. The Ministry is likewise empowered to erect memorials to young widows who have not married a second time! China, by the way, is already studded by such monuments. In the interest of marriageable spinsters we might start a similar custom.

There are many religions in China. Considerable sections of the population are Buddhists and Mohammedans, although their beliefs and practices differ widely from the Indian sects. But Confucianism is the basis of Chinese ethics. Confucius was a moral teacher, claiming no divine mission and promising no future rewards for well-doing. He preached love of country, truthfulness, fair dealing, courtesy, and ancestor-worship.

At Washington, both in public and private, I was much impressed by the Chinese representatives—their delightful manners, their mode of speech, and their sense of humour. One felt instinctively that the Chinese are a race of gentlemen. But one also regretted that such a Conference should be necessary.

No article regarding China would be complete without a brief reference to the opium question. Notwithstanding severe measures of prohibition, opium is still consumed in large quantities. Instead of being imported, it is grown in China. Owing to the parlous condition of the Central Government, this is done with impunity. The cigarette has, however, become very popular. The story of its introduction is a commercial romance. When the importation of opium was prohibited, an enterprising firm of tobacco manufacturers sent emissaries roaming through China, smoking and giving away cigarettes. As a result, the Chinese now consume hundreds of millions daily.

WHERE IS CHINA GOING?

Why does the prodigal son always receive more attention than the well-behaved members of the family? Why, for instance, are we so solicitous regarding Russia and so indifferent about China, one of our best and oldest customers? Queen Elizabeth and her advisers, with their usual shrewdness and foresight, were the first to appreciate the importance of China for trading purposes. Hence the Queen's famous letter to the Emperor demanding trade facilities. In 1923 China took thirty million pounds' worth of our exports, mostly textiles. Therefore the ruin of our Chinese trade would mean sackcloth and ashes for Lancashire. On the other hand, it is impossible to estimate the commercial possibilities of this vast country with its frugal and industrious population of 400,000,000—nearly ten times that of the United Kingdom.

Since the Revolution in 1911, when the Republic was declared, China has been harassed by the factions of rival military leaders and politicians, supported by large armies, mostly consisting of brigands and bandits. These number some million and a half. They are chiefly maintained on the proceeds of opium grown in defiance of the law. In 1923 the crop

amounted to about 11,000 tons, or more than ten times the total product of the rest of the world. Despite these chaotic conditions and the absence of an effective Government, Chinese trade—both imports and exports—continued to flourish down to 1923. According to the 1924 edition of that useful and remarkable annual, "The China Year Book" (Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, and Kent, 42*s.*), comparing 1913 with 1922 the imports and exports increased in value by more than a half, but allowance must of course be made for increased prices. Furthermore, the modernizing of China progressed at a great pace. The railway system was extended and improved; new harbours were constructed and existing ones brought up to date; roads were modernized; thousands of miles of telegraph lines were erected, wireless stations were set up; hundreds of factories were built and new industries started. For instance, 115 cotton mills have been erected since 1890, most of them during recent years. These developments are partly due to the Chinese themselves and partly to foreigners—British, Japanese, Americans, etc.

The Chinaman's outstanding feature is industry. Government or no government, good government or bad government, he goes on with his job. His wages are low: 1*s.* 2*d.* per day is high remuneration, and he works long hours. Agriculture is, of course, the chief industry. Eighty-five per cent. of the population are on the land. China moves slowly, but when necessary this conservative race can adapt itself to changing conditions. Owing to Indian competition

and the failure of the Russian market, China has lost the bulk of her tea trade. The resourceful Chinese have, however, turned their attention to the production of other commodities. For example, China is now the third largest producer of cotton. It is impossible to estimate the effect upon China's trade of the civil war, but the prospects are not reassuring. The operations of the military commanders are causing widespread dismay amongst the commercial classes, who heartily wish for peace.

The importance of China as a world factor is recognized by America, Japan, and Russia, all of whom take a keen interest in Chinese affairs. America and Japan do an even larger trade with China than we do, and one of America's main objects in calling the Washington Conference was to hamper the progress of the Japanese in China and to consolidate and improve her own position. The Chinese have noted the decisions arrived at, but have not given effect to them. The same remark applies to the other nations concerned. The Japanese in their own persistent and practical fashion have long been penetrating, peacefully and otherwise, this vast and rich country. The Soviet Government, not to be behindhand, have flooded it with Bolshevist propaganda. The success of the Japanese Delegation at the Peace Conference in Paris roused the whole country to indignation, revived the national spirit, and gave emphasis to the reform movement started in 1898, now called the New Culture or New Thought Movement.

Chinese traditions and habits are in the melting-pot. This is partly due to the material changes described, railways, telegraphs, etc., and partly to the changed mentality of the educated classes. Mr. Woodhead, the brilliant Editor of the "Year Book," says:

All traditional values are now being judged from a new standpoint and with new standards. From the small feet and concubinage to Confucianism and Christianity, nothing is free from this new process of valuation. Some of the judgments may be too subjective or too superficial; others may be too harsh or unhistorical. All the same, the existence of the evaluating attitude cannot be denied. . . .

At the present moment the whole movement is still in the stage of largely destructive criticism. The cry of revolt is heard everywhere. Tradition is often thrown overboard, authority is cast aside, old beliefs are being undermined. . . .

Of the constructive phase of the movement very little can be said at the present time. The time has been too short and the outbreak too sudden for any tangible results to be safely estimated. All we can say is that there is a Chinese Renaissance and that a new China is being born. There is no longer mere modernization of externals and non-essentials, but a great change is coming over the whole fabric of national life. The attitude of criticism has undermined all old beliefs and ideals, and new ideas and ideals are flooding in for comparison and selection. Old institutions are being critically examined, and antiquity and authority are no longer sufficient justifications for the existence of any custom or institution. The vast amount of old tradition and learning is being systematically worked over with modern methodology of historical research. The history of thought is being rewritten, and Confucianism, understood in its historical setting, is now recognized as only one of the numerous schools of thought, and not *the* all-embracing religion as we were once made to believe. The history of language and literature is also studied anew, and we are beginning to realize that the classical literature which has engaged the attention of the classical literati for thousands of years was not the only literature which the artistic genius of the Chinese

people has produced, and that the genius of the people has been working steadily and unceasingly at the revision and gradual perfection of the living tongue with which they, the real makers of literature, have given us their great songs, stories, and dramas. It is no slavish worship of the Western civilization that we are witnessing, but the rebirth of an old civilization under the influence of a new impulse and a new attitude which direct contact with the ideas and methods of the modern world has produced.

It is, however, clear that with such a huge population spread over such a wide area the diffusion of new ideas is not likely to be rapid.

The future of China is one of the great problems of the world, and it is surprising that the British public take so little interest in it.

BALANCE-SHEET ENGLISH

A Bright American Idea

In these days, when shares and other securities are so widely spread amongst all classes, is it desirable to make the balance-sheets of great companies or societies, with vast numbers of shareholders or members, more easy of comprehension by the ordinary man or woman who does not understand business terms? In America, where they rarely take for granted that anyone knows anything, the experiment has been made. My friend Lord Weir has kindly sent me the yearly report of the People's Gas Light and Coke Company of Chicago, which has a yearly income of some £650,000. It is a remarkable little book, designed, as the preface states, so as to be "easily understandable by those least acquainted with the words and phrases commonly used in commercial statements." I am told that other large American companies adopt the same plan. In the balance-sheet and profit and loss account each item is explained. For example:

Plant and Equipment—so much. (This amount represents the cost to the company of the land, buildings, holders, gas mains, service pipes, meters, furniture and fixtures, miscellaneous production station and distribution shop equipment, storeroom equip-

ment, and all other equipment used in the production, distribution, and utilization of gas and other operations necessary to the rendering of service to our customers.)

Investments in Affiliated Companies—so much. (This represents the sum the company has invested in companies controlled wholly by it.)

Cash—so much. (This was the amount of money in bank and in the company's offices December 31, 1922.)

Sundry Debtors—so much. (This was the money owing to the company on the above date on various accounts other than those above stated, including rent due from tenants, amounts due from customers for services rendered, and various other items.)

Materials and Supplies—so much. (This is the cost to the company of coal, coke, and oil on hand necessary to ensure the continuous operation of the plants, and other materials required for production, distribution, and utilization of gas and to maintain the company's property and render efficient service.)

Provident Fund and Securities—so much. (This is a sum set aside out of earnings for the purpose of insuring the annuities to employés who are retired in accordance with the provisions of the annuity or pension plan followed by the company. This amount safeguards the reward to an employé for long, faithful, and loyal service to the company.)

Sundry Creditors—so much. (This represents sundry amounts for which the company is liable and which have not been disposed of at the close of the year ; unclaimed wages, refunds on gas bills, unidentified remittances, and sundry other items make up this sum.)

Depreciation and Reserve—so much. (In order to keep everything up to the highest possible degree of efficiency, an amount must be charged to the operations of the company to provide for such purpose. That amount, in order to record what the company has deducted from its revenue to insure the proper maintenance of its properties, is set up in the form of a reserve to provide for any form of depreciation which affects the company's property over a period of time. In order to ensure an even distribution of this expense, so that the charges will not be excessive one year, and in another be very small, a stipulated amount is charged to the operations each month to equalize the provision for this expenditure.)

These extracts, however, give no fair idea of the accounts as a whole in their novel dress. The explanatory notes turn a dull document into attractive reading even for those who understand accountancy terms, and the number of those who do not understand them is probably much underestimated. It may, of course, be urged that there is no reason why accounts should be made attractive, and that the explanations are futile and rather childish. To this criticism the answer may be made that the great increase in the joint-stock, co-operative, and building society systems makes a more widespread and intelligent interest in the balance-sheets of these concerns a matter of national importance.

The Gas Company's accounts not only display the company's financial position, but may be regarded as useful educational work concerning the mechanism of a great industrial undertaking and as valuable advertising. They are another instance of the growing habit in America of endeavouring to teach the public regarding business methods. While at home we are disputing about this "ism" and that "ism," in America the commercial classes are cutting across these theoretical arguments by educating the American public in the mysteries of finance, trade, and commerce.

When summarizing in the *Daily Telegraph* the annual speeches of the chairmen of insurance companies, Sir William Schooling laments their lack of imagination and their neglect to utilize the occasion to educate the public about the nature and importance

of insurance as a factor in the financial and economic prosperity of the world. He goes on to point out that when Mr. Alfred Noyes visited one of the American observatories, being a poet, he saw beyond the mechanism of the instruments to the wonders which they revealed, and wrote his fascinating poem, "The Torch Bearers." Sir William suggests that if the chairmen of our great insurance companies had some few grains of imagination, they might, in their own sphere, rival Mr. Noyes. This is expecting rather much from commercial magnates, but it is a pity that more effective use is not made of the valuable information contained in speeches delivered by chairmen of leading companies, and that some of them do not take more advantage of their opportunities to instruct the public.

The report refers to another important educational method now becoming common in America. Lectures were delivered to the staff on salesmanship, gas manufacture, and other subjects, in addition to which tours were arranged to enable them to visit the offices and works of gas companies in other towns. This system is having a marked effect upon American commerce and is rapidly extending. Owing to the Immigration Law, labour is scarce and highly paid, and the object of the employer is to make his staff as efficient as possible. The salesmanship lectures in particular are most detailed.

Trade disputes in America are far more bitter and deadly than in this country, but on the other hand there seems to be a more general inclination on the

part of employers to provide their staffs with opportunities to learn about the working of the business in which they are engaged : in other words, to convert them from mere wage-earners into intelligent participators in the conduct of the business, or at any rate the department in which they are employed. In most countries there is an insistent demand by the worker for "a voice in the management," and many American employers seem to think it advantageous both for employer and employed that the staff should be made acquainted with the problems which have to be faced from week to week.

In this country Whitley Councils were intended to meet these requirements, but the experiment has not proved a success. Nevertheless, many large firms are dealing with the matter in their own way. Much interesting information on the subject of industrial organization in Britain, America, France, and Germany may be obtained from Mr. John Lee's interesting book on that subject published by Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons. I think, however, that more specific information is required as to the practical working of the various schemes described before an accurate opinion can be formed regarding them. It is one thing to see such a scheme described on paper, and another to watch it in actual operation.

Mr. Lee tells us some interesting things about capital and labour in France and Germany. Whether he is accurate I do not know, not having studied the questions on the spot. He says that the relations between employer and employed in France are hap-

pier than in any other country, the reason being the survival of the patriarchal system and the general recognition, more than once embodied in legislation, that labour has rights in a business other than wage-earning. So far as I can understand, rights of the same sort as those of grown-up sons who work for their father for a wage. The business belongs to the father, who takes the profits and decides the policy, but keeps in close communion with the sons, whose advice he occasionally asks and who are regarded as wage-paid coadjutors and not as employés.

If Mr. Lee is right, the fact will come as a surprise to many who are apt to underestimate the French. Having regard to the trend of events, it is a pity that we here do not better understand French methods and those of other nations. To-day France is one of the three foremost nations of the world. Her methods differ materially from those of the two great Anglo-Saxon communities, but she "gets there" all the same, and her social system deserves careful study. It may not suit the Anglo-Saxon, but it is well that we should know what it is. In Germany Mr. Lee states that more mechanical methods are adopted. A sort of Parliament consisting of representatives of capital and labour has been set up, to which all industrial legislation is referred for inquiry and report. The Parliament, which consists of some 300 members, comprising the leaders of capital and labour, has no legislative authority, but is described as a most powerful institution. The experiment seems incompatible with Parliamentary government

as understood in this country and America. It will be interesting to see how it works.

Before concluding I may mention a striking gas and broadcasting development. The People's Gas Company give a fifteen minutes' daily "food talk" by radio every morning at 11.30 "for stay-at-home women," and three telephones are constantly in use answering inquiries concerning broadcast recipes, menus, and housekeeping hints!

GROPING FOR THE MIND

A BATTLE is raging in the medical world on the long and much-debated question, " What is mind ? " Hitherto this controversy has been mostly confined to philosophers, metaphysicians, orthodox Christians, unbelievers, and spiritualists, but now it has taken another turn, and mental scientists are debating whether, in treating mental disorders, mind is to be considered as a physiological product of the brain, or a separate immaterial entity working through the brain.

To put the matter in another way, whether the brain is a laboratory which makes mind, or whether it is a clearing-house through which mind passes. The physiological school point to the fact that mental processes are due to physical and chemical changes in the brain caused by the oxygen in the blood by which it is served, and, according to a recent discovery by Sir Frederick Mott, F.R.S., by the iron and phosphorus in the brain-cells (" Archives of Neurology," Vol. 8. P. S. King). They also point to the fact that insanity is almost invariably accompanied by structural or chemical defects of the brain and nervous system. The psychic school, on the other hand, contend that mind acts and reacts upon the

body, and that the defects mentioned are due to some inherited or acquired mental taint or peculiarity which prejudicially affects the structure or chemical processes of the brain (Jung's "Analytical Philosophy").

Obviously this dispute has a direct bearing upon vital questions not relating to medical treatment. The belief in a spirit or soul has been almost universal. In 1871 Professor Tylor published his "Primitive Culture," in which he put forward the theory that this belief was founded on the inability of primitive races to explain sleep, trances, and death in any other way. While dreaming the sleeper imagines himself to be far distant from the place where he fell asleep, and to have done things which he could not have done had he remained there. The only feasible explanation was a dual personality, which theory was supported by the sight of his immaterial shadow. Death was regarded as a prolonged sleep in which the *alter ego* had taken a long journey. Professor Tylor's theory is, of course, in direct opposition to the orthodox conception of the soul or spirit which depends upon faith and divine revelation.

The Greeks were much interested in the nature of mind, the relations of mind and body, and the relations of both to the external world. Parmenides, the Greek philosopher, who lived 2,500 years ago, started the discussion by alleging on logical grounds that we can really know nothing but mind, that the world as we conceive it is an illusion, and that the universe consists not of many things but of one thing, a single,

indivisible, timeless, changeless whole. Prima facie this may seem absurd, but the questions raised by Parmenides have agitated philosophers ever since. Zeno, Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Kant, Hegel, Reid, Hamilton, the two Mills, Herbert Spencer, and many more, have wrestled with the still unsolved problems. What do we know? How do we know? What can we know?

Do we possess intuitive knowledge of the universe, or is our knowledge exclusively derived from the senses? Do they give us correct impressions of the outer world? Is there an outer world? Do we know anything but our own minds? And if that is the sum of our knowledge, are there many minds or only one—a universal mind—of which our so-called minds are undivided homogeneous parts? Each philosopher has had his own theories, and they have differed widely.

The story is well told in Mr. McDougall's "Body and Mind" (Methuen). To-day Mr. Bradley, the author of "Appearance and Reality," may be regarded as the chief exponent in this country of the school of thought which relies upon a priori reasoning to establish that the real universe is quite different from what it appears to be. Mr. Bertrand Russell, in "Our Knowledge of the External World" (George Allen), gives a brief account of Mr. Bradley's philosophy:

> Mr. Bradley's "Appearance and Reality" is a book consisting of two parts, the first called "Appearance" and the second "Reality." The first part examines and condemns almost all that

makes up our everyday world : things and qualities, relations, space and time, change, causation, activity, the self. All these, though in some sense facts which qualify reality, are not real as they appear. What is real is one single, indivisible, timeless whole, called the Absolute, which is in some sense spiritual, but does not consist of souls, or of thought and will as we know them.[1]

It may be asked, how do the believers in such theories square them with the facts of everyday life? The answer is that they do not make the attempt. The pursuit of perfect truth is one thing and everyday life another. Indeed, Professor Bradley says in his "Principles of Logic" (Oxford University Press), that the discovery of perfect truth is the main purpose of true logic, and that in his actual (by which I suppose he means practical, everyday) reasoning he has never troubled about logic. Great philosophers who are also eminent judges attack the most mundane problems, such as the history of "Old Tom" Gin (see the Law Reports), with the same acuteness and fervour as their brethren who are orthodox Christians or materialists. The same remark applies to Christian Scientists. Christian Science, so far as I can understand from Mrs. Eddy's book (if she was the author—I note that some one else claims to have written it), seems to be based on the idea of the universal mind or Absolute, which is

[1] Mr. Bertrand Russell suggests "that a truer image of the world may be obtained by picturing things as entering into the stream of time from an external world outside than from a view which regards time as the devouring tyrant of all that is." This suggestion, implying as it does the existence of two worlds, one eternal and the other finite, seems open to the same criticism as its author levels against Mr. Bradley's ideal world.

interpreted as the Almighty. All individuals must be in unison with the Universal and unity must be maintained by prayer. I may not have correctly interpreted the creed in detail, but this is its general idea.

One thing seems certain. Our knowledge of the world outside ourselves is derived exclusively from our sensations. To give a favourite example used by metaphysicians: An orange is yellow, soft, and round, with a certain smell and taste. How are we aware of these qualities? Obviously only through the medium of our senses. A man without sight, hearing, touch, smell, or taste could not know anything about an orange. Therefore, say some philosophers, as knowledge depends exclusively upon sensations, what reasons have we for the belief that colour, form, etc., exist except in our minds?

The usual answer is that the belief in the reality of things is intuitive and incapable of further explanation. Here we must leave this abstruse subject, with the remark that for ordinary purposes we have to assume that what is is, and that the world is what we conceive it to be—conclusions corresponding with those of preceding generations. But this acceptance is subject to the reservation that we must be ever ready to extend and revise our beliefs, having regard to more extended and accurate information.

It is obvious that there is a wide gulf between the transcendental idea started by Parmenides and theories such as those of the Evolutionists, who say that the mind has been built up by the transmitted and accumulated experiences of each generation,

or those of the medico-psychic school already explained. The transcendental idea postulates the non-existence of the world as we know it, and the existence of another world which, for practical purposes at any rate, must be disregarded.

We can all conceive that mind differs from body, and some may be willing to give adherence to the theory that there are two worlds, the world of mind and the world of matter, or to that of William James, the American philosopher, who, as I understand, propounds the idea that there is a reservoir of " mind stuff " of which small chunks are detached for the use of each individual during life, returning after death to the " mind pool." These theories, however, do not lead us far. The vital question is whether the mind retains its personality. John Stuart Mill says : " There is something I call Myself or my mind, which I consider as distinct from my sensations, thoughts, emotions, and volitions—a something which I conceive to be not the thoughts, etc., but the being which has the thoughts. But what this being is, though it is Myself, I have no knowledge other than a certain thread of consciousness." For 2,500 years mankind have been groping for an explanation of this mysterious, elusive ego, and they are groping still.

> You cannot grasp it. Seize the breath of morn,
> Or bind the perfume of the rose as well.

A BUILDER OF WISDOM

If Wren was aware of what was happening on this planet, he must have had an entertaining time during his centenary celebrations. Being a modest man, he was no doubt overwhelmed by the compliments showered upon him, and as a philosopher secretly amused at the criticism to which he was subjected. It would be interesting on these Centenary occasions to learn what the great men concerned think about us.

I can imagine Wren, for example, who had a pretty wit and a vigorous style, making pungent comments upon some of the more modern buildings, probably enforcing his argument by reiterating that "building certainly should have the attribute of eternal, and therefore be the only thing incapable of new fashions," adding that the adaptation of an existing model is preferable in many cases to a new creation by the architect. I can also imagine him, being a business man and a great organizer, indicating the necessity under modern conditions for a revision of architectural methods, so as to minimize "extras," the bugbear of the building owner. To this end he might well advise more detailed drawings and specifications, after the style now adopted by the best American architects.

The Centenary was prolific. It brought forth a mass of interesting and instructive books and articles, including an entertaining little work by my friend, Sir Lawrence Weaver (*Country Life*, Ltd.). I shall not endeavour to review this flood of literature, but try to describe what sort of a man Wren was. Carlyle remarked that Chelsea Hospital, one of Wren's masterpieces, "looked the work of a gentleman." This was a shrewd observation. He was a great gentleman, with a stately disposition, stately manners, and a stately but vivacious mind. At sixteen he was highly educated and busily engaged with mathematical problems and scientific inventions of no mean order. He lived to ninety, having spent seventy-five years in unremitting but pleasurable toil. He resembled the great engines that draw express trains. His pace was quick and constant. He never seemed in a hurry. Before he reached his destination he gently slowed down, and, having reached it, quietly shut off the steam.

He retired from active work at eighty-five. As Miss Milman tells us in her book, during the last five years of his life it was his custom once a year to drive from his house at Hampton Court to St. Paul's. For some time he would sit under the dome and then return to dine. His last visit was on the day of his death, February 25, 1723. After dinner his servant came to tell him it was bedtime. He found the old man seated in the bow-window overlooking his garden. He had gone to rest elsewhere, dying

as he had lived, calm and dignified, an outstanding example of a great Englishman.

Wren's mind was of the practical order which does things and does them well. But he also had imagination, which enabled him to discover new methods and design beautiful things. His interests were varied. He applied himself with equal zest to mathematical problems, physical and biological investigations, architecture, town planning, building construction, decoration, and scientific inventions, such as barometers; "Probable Ways for Making Fresh Water at Sea"; "Divers Improvements in the Art of Husbandry"; "Secure and Speedier Ways for Taking Forts than by Approaches and Galleries"; "Ways of Submarine Navigation"; "A Speaking Organ Articulating Sounds"; "A Method of Writing in the Dark"; "To Write Double by an Instrument"; several new ways of graving and etching; "To Purge or Vomit, or alter the Mass by Injection into the Blood by Plaisters and Various Dressings"; "A Pavement, harder, fairer and cheaper than Marble"; "A Way of Embroidery for Beds Hangings, cheap and fair."

Even the proper way to preach so as to make the voice carry did not escape his attention, and he forestalled modern sanitary reformers by pointing out the undesirability of church burials and the necessity for constructing cemeteries outside towns. He never seems to have been tired or bored or to have wanted a holiday. When one reads of these giants who fruited so young, who did so much and

in many cases lived so long, one is disposed to wonder whether modern fears of the dangers of precocity are justified. Clever children who are "being kept back" are frequent nowadays. In Wren's time the theory of "keeping back" seems to have been unknown. So far as we can judge, young persons, both male and female, amongst the educated classes, were far more advanced educationally than they are now. Perhaps this was due to greater concentration upon scholastic work, and to the fewer demands upon the nervous energy of the pupils by outside occupations and amusements.

Trained as a doctor of medicine, Wren's fame as a mathematician led to his being appointed Professor of Astronomy at Gresham College when only twenty-four. At twenty-eight he took a leading part in founding the Royal Society, and at twenty-nine was appointed by King Charles II Assistant Surveyor-General, the equivalent in those days of Assistant Commissioner of Works. He had had no previous experience of architecture, and his appointment was no doubt due not only to his remarkable record and engaging personality, but also to the influence of his friend, the celebrated John Evelyn, a recognized authority on building. In 1669 Wren became Surveyor-General. His mastery of mathematics and geometry, his sense of proportion and colour, and his power to visualize his designs, soon made him one of the foremost architects in Europe.

There is no need to describe his manifold architectural works: St. Paul's, his fifty-three churches,

Greenwich and Chelsea Hospitals, part of Hampton Court, Kensington Palace; Queen's College Library, Oxford; Emmanuel Chapel, Cambridge; Kilmainham Hospital, Dublin, etc. In 1689 he became M.P. for Windsor. At eighty-five he was ejected from his post of Surveyor-General, which he had held for forty-nine years, his successor being an unskilled person, not worthy to lace the shoes of the great man, and attempts were made to mar his cathedral, on which he had worked for forty-five years, by ill-advised alterations and additions. As he wrote in his diary, "And there arose a king who knew not Joseph" (Acts vii) (in Wren's case, King George I). "And Gallio cared for none of these things."

Wren bore his troubles with characteristic equanimity, although he put up a stout fight for his rights. He was fortified by the knowledge that his works were "good." As his son said in the well-known epitaph, "For his memorial, look around you." No man has greater opportunities for fame or infamy than an architect. Architectural failures are a continuing scourge to mankind. Conversely, beautiful buildings are a perpetual joy, and by far the most important of all artistic influences because they are constantly before us. In a happy phrase Emerson said: "Raphael paints wisdom, Handel sings it, Phidias carves it, Shakespeare writes it, Wren builds it, Columbus sails it, Luther preaches it, Washington arms it, Watt mechanizes it." Indeed, Wren did more to elevate public taste in England than any other man. His work set a standard of architectural

nobility and beauty which insensibly appeals to every class, rich and poor, educated and uneducated. When in the presence of these "great gentlemen" amongst the buildings of the world, we all feel they are fine things and are proud that they belong to us.

CUPID ASKS SOME CURIOUS QUESTIONS

"Love rules the court, the camp, the grove,
And man below and saints above,
For love is heaven, and heaven is love."

THIS amatory effusion at the head of a letter naturally attracted my attention—(my correspondent, by the way, is wrong in attributing the lines to Lord Byron)—particularly as the writer goes on to explain that his object is to obtain information about various financial questions with a view to early matrimony. The somewhat discursive contents of the letter may be summarized as follows:

1. What is the difference between debentures and debenture stock?
2. What is a cumulative preference share?
3. What is a deferred ordinary share?
4. What is a mortgage? (Correspondent please note that the word is not spelt "morgage.")
5. How do you get into touch with a stock-broker or a stock-jobber, and what is the difference between the two?
6. What is the best method of investing about £2,000, partly savings and partly inherited?

Notwithstanding the alluring quotation, I had intended to pass the letter by, but on inquiry found so many people who were unable to answer the first five questions clearly that I determined to try what I could do.

First, it is necessary to say a few words regarding Joint-Stock Companies. In the old days, companies were formed by Royal Charter or special Act of Parliament. Then, in 1862, came the Companies Act, under which any commercial enterprise could be registered with "limited liability"—a term invented by Lord Bramwell, who, referring to the importance of the suggestion, said that the words "limited liability" should be written on his tombstone. The object was to enable investors to put money into a concern without being liable to contribute more than a specified sum. Apart from such an arrangement, the investment on a profit-sharing basis of £100 in a business might make the investor liable for its debts to an unlimited extent.

The Act enabled people who wanted capital to get it and people who had spare capital to invest it without undue liability. But as in the case of our old friend the Statute of Uses, the Limited Liability Act was diverted to strange purposes for which it was not intended. An accurate history of the past hundred years would show the enormous influence exercised by the joint-stock system. It is no figure of speech to say that it has revolutionized industry, commerce, and the relations of employers and employed. It has proved a valuable and flexible instrument for developing the resources of the world, but it has also proved a valuable and flexible instrument in the hands of the company promoter, who has thus been able to saddle the community with billions

of inflated capital now held by myriads of investors large and small, many of whom are interested through the medium of insurance companies, friendly societies, and similar institutions. The joint-stock system is not peculiar to Britain. In varying forms, with its attendant benefits and disadvantages, it exists in all civilized countries. The Act of 1862 has been repealed and the law regarding companies is now comprised in the Companies Act, 1908.

Now to come to my correspondent's questions, which can best be answered by a brief description of the constitution of a typical limited liability or joint-stock company—different names for the same thing—but, to be precise, some joint-stock companies, such as railways, are registered under special Acts. The usual plan is to form the company so as to provide opportunities for different classes of investors. Some regard safety as the chief desideratum and are prepared to accept a comparatively low return on their money, while others are willing to take more risk with the possibility of high profits. To cater for these varying requirements many companies issue debentures or debenture stock, preference shares, ordinary shares, and sometimes deferred ordinary shares or founders' shares. The debentures or debenture stock are usually a mortgage or charge on the company's assets, carrying a fixed rate of interest, but, although the word "debenture" is extensively used, its precise meaning has never been determined, and eminent judges have frequently commented on this curious fact. Any explanation regarding deben-

tures must therefore be subject to this qualification.

The chief practical difference between debentures and debenture stock is that debentures are issued for fixed sums, whereas debenture stock can be cut up, so to speak, into slices of different sizes. A company may issue £100,000 debentures divided into 1,000 of £100 each, or alternatively £100,000 debenture stock which can be taken up in any and varying proportions—£5, £20, £35, £1,000, and so forth. Preference shares are also designed for the delectation of the investor who is playing for safety, but the promised return by way of dividend is usually larger than the interest offered on debentures or debenture stock. Preference, like ordinary, dividends can be paid out of profits only, whereas debenture interest, being a debt, is a charge on capital as well as income.

Many people erroneously assume that the statement in a prospectus that preference dividends will be paid half-yearly implies that the payment will be made whether profits are earned or not. They do not appreciate that preference, like ordinary, dividends can only be paid out of profits. The rights of preference shareholders depend upon the company's memorandum and articles of association. Usually, the dividend on preference shares is not cumulative. The preference shareholder must look to the profits of the year. If these are inadequate to pay the preference dividend, the preference shareholders cannot require the arrears to be made up from the profits of succeeding years.

Cumulative preference shares, however, entitle the holder to payment of his dividend out of future profits should those of any year be insufficient for the purpose.

In some companies, holders of preference shares are entitled to a fixed dividend and to participate to a limited extent with the ordinary shareholders in the surplus profits. But it is beyond the scope of this article to describe the manifold variations adopted to lure the investor. Deferred ordinary and founders' shares are modern creations which entitle the holders to the whole or a proportion of the surplus profits. The ordinary thus become a species of second preference shares, differing only in name. Many companies are formed in such a way that while the control and surplus profits belong to the holders of the deferred ordinary or founders' shares, practically the whole capital has been provided by the debenture, preference, and ordinary shareholders.

There is a marked difference between London stock-brokers and stock-jobbers. Both are members of the London Stock Exchange and subject to its stringent rules, but a stock-jobber may deal only with a member of the Stock Exchange, whereas a stock-broker deals with the public. Stock-jobbers buy stocks and shares from brokers, and sell them to other brokers at the best profit available. A member of the Stock Exchange may, however, change his vocation. He may be a broker this month and a jobber next month. Jobbers specialize in the different markets—Government securities, bank

shares, industrials, oils, etc. If a broker asks a jobber to make him a price for a certain number of certain shares, and the jobber complies, he must be prepared to sell or buy at the price quoted.

For example, if he quotes £5 to £5$\frac{1}{8}$, he must buy at the former or sell at the latter price. No member of the London Stock Exchange is permitted to advertise, and the same rule exists in most of the provincial Stock Exchanges, but there is no difficulty in getting into touch with a stock-broker. They are "thick as leaves in Vallombrosa." My correspondent's banker or solicitor will no doubt supply the name of a suitable firm. As to mortgages, a mortgage is a charge to secure a sum of money and interest. Almost all classes of property may be mortgaged. A mortgage of furniture or chattels is called a bill of sale.

Now, having replied to the first five questions, I propose to consider the sixth, and, from my correspondent's point of view, most important, viz., how to invest his £2,000. Much as I should like to assist him in his matrimonial adventure, I am unable to recommend any specific investment. He must be satisfied with a few general observations on investing money.

First, it must be remembered that some people have the money sense—the gift of picking out good investments, just as some have an ear for music. Many successful professional men, business men, and manufacturers do not possess the gift, as they know to their cost, but, generally speaking, good judgment

in the matter of investments depends upon experience and knowledge. Second, many investors are unduly influenced by the fact that well-known people are connected with a company. Good names are no guarantee. On the other hand, unsatisfactory names should serve as a warning, however sound the concern may otherwise appear. Three, the balance-sheet and profit and loss account are valuable guides. Copies are usually obtainable through a stock-broker. Everyone should learn how to understand an ordinary balance-sheet and profit and loss account.

The company's cash and liquid resources should be noted; also whether its liquid assets exceed its current obligations. It must, however, be admitted that the complicated accounts of many great companies are beyond the ken of the ordinary man! Four, do not put all your eggs in one basket. Five, do not pay attention to tips about good things. They are often given with an object, or the tipster's information is frequently faulty. Six, if you are doubtful in what to invest, leave your money at your banker's on deposit or invest in Government securities. Regarding bank deposits—there is much misapprehension about what is called "the bank rate." This is a rate of interest fixed from time to time by the Bank of England for lending money for seven days on first-class commercial or Stock Exchange securities. The deposit rate allowed by bankers is 1, or sometimes 2, per cent. below the Bank of England loan rate. Special terms may sometimes be made for large sums deposited for fixed periods. It

must not be assumed, however, that all borrowers can satisfy their requirements at bank rate. If the Bank of England are charging 3 per cent. for seven-day loans, the ordinary borrower will probably have to pay 5 or 6 per cent. on loans or overdrafts. Government securities, repayable in the course of the next few years, can be purchased to pay nearly 5 per cent.

It is better to be satisfied with a low return on your capital than risk it without adequate knowledge. Considering the trouble people take to earn money, it is surprising how little they take to inquire about the stability, constitution, and prospects of undertakings in which they meditate an investment. It is difficult to make or save money, but it is almost as difficult not to lose it when you have got it. Seven, do not be greedy for a high return. High rates are almost certain to involve equal risks. Eight, my correspondent inquires whether I should advise him to purchase a house for occupation. He says that he has one in view that will pay him 6 per cent. on the price. He might go farther and fare worse. The property might form a more stable investment than stocks and shares. When all is said, an untrained individual knows more about houses than about Stock Exchange securities, which usually are nothing but names to him. He can see or ascertain whether the house is well built ; he can find out what the rent should be and at what sum per annum it is rated. He can inquire what similar houses in the district have fetched. He can judge whether the neighbourhood is going up or down and can estimate the cost

of repairs and fire insurance premiums. He can thus decide what balance will be available for interest on the purchase-money. Supposing the rent or estimated rent to be £60 per annum, and the estimated cost of repairs, insurance, etc., £15, the balance of £45 would be available for interest on the purchase-money. If this were £750, the return would be 6 per cent., assuming the property to be freehold. If leasehold, an allowance would have to be made to provide for the return of the capital during the unexpired period of the lease. There are tables showing what the allowance should be, but in most cases it is wise before purchasing to get a valuation by a competent surveyor or house-agent. This does not cost much, but the fee should be arranged beforehand. As to the balance of my correspondent's capital, he might ask his bankers to supply him with a list of sound investments suitable for trustees, and then invest £100 in each of those he fancies. He should be able to get about 5 per cent. without risk. If he wants more, he must use his brains, or rely upon the best advice he can get.

There are two other terms which it may be well to explain—"Trustee securities" and "Gilt-edged securities." The former are the stocks in which Trust Funds may be invested, subject to any provision to the contrary in the deed or will creating the Trust. These securities are described as such in the lists issued by stock-brokers, and may be taken to comprise the safest securities available. They have a fixed rate of interest, and are, therefore, like to depreciate in

value when the price of money is high. On the other hand, being well secured, they are not liable to the fluctuations that attend ordinary mercantile investments. " Gilt-edged securities " is a Stock Exchange term for trustee securities and certain others of the same class.

UNTYING LAND KNOTS

Law that Henry VIII gave Us

The hoary old Statute of Uses is on its last legs. Before long it will be quietly dead and buried. Only friends and relatives, in the shape of lawyers, land agents, and historians, will attend the funeral. The general public know little of this powerful old Act of Parliament, which has dominated England for five hundred years. Passed for one purpose, it was used for another, and at once became part and parcel of our national life. The statute was intended to prevent secret and illegal conveyances of land and buildings.

Ecclesiastics were the chief delinquents. Not being permitted to hold landed property, in those days the chief subject of wealth, it was their custom to get pious persons to convey or will it in trust, so that the apparent owner was a layman while the real owner was the Church. Parliament met the difficulty by passing the Statute of Uses, which ordained that when land was conveyed by A to B to the use of or in trust for C it passed directly to C, the beneficial owner. Therefore, in the case of conveyances for the benefit of the Church, the land at once became

amenable to the law prohibiting such transfers. But the statute had unexpected results. For technical reasons, which it is needless to explain, lawyers discovered that it could be used as a convenient method of land transfer, particularly when successive interests were to be created. Consequently the Statute of Uses became the basis of the system of conveyancing which has obtained in England since the time of Henry VIII, now to be replaced by the new one comprised in the voluminous Law of Property Act which comes into force on January 1, 1926. The old statute has had, therefore, a long, vigorous career. Through many political vicissitudes it has held its own. Hundreds of millions of people have been affected directly or indirectly by its provisions, millions of deeds have been drawn in accordance with it, myriads of lawyers have scrutinized and construed it, and it possesses a vast and abstruse literature, for dryness and subtlety only equalled by that of metaphysics. Before long it will be relegated to the lumber-room containing vanished laws and customs.

But there will be more than one funeral when the Law of Property Act comes into force. The heir-at-law, hero of hundreds of plays and romances, and primogeniture, the bugbear of the Radicals of the early part of the last century, are also dying. After December 31, 1925, if the owner of freehold property (houses, land, etc.) dies intestate, *i.e.*, without a will, it will be divided amongst his next-of-kin, as hereafter explained. In the case of an intestacy, the eldest son will then be reduced to the

same rank as his brothers and sisters. But, of course, this change will not affect property settled by deed or will or the habit of many parents of singling out their first-born son for special benefits.

The Act introduces other vital changes. After December 31, 1925, generally speaking, only absolute interests may be created in landed property, and where limited interests now exist machinery is provided for dealing with them on sale or transfer as if they were absolute. In other words, to simplify conveyancing all trusts are practically removed from the title, and, to use the words of the framers of the Act, " placed behind a curtain." Therefore, with some limitations, a *bona-fide* purchaser need only trouble about the person in whom the property is vested. As Shakespeare says, he can " close up his eyes and draw the curtain close." Unfortunately, however, the curtain has a few holes in it, through which, no doubt, clever lawyers will try to poke their fingers. The beneficial interest in freeholds may still be settled or devised in trust, like stocks, shares, or any other class of property. The point is that, subject to limitations, the purchaser will only have to deal with the person in whom the land is vested, just in the same way that purchasers of stocks and shares need only look to the person whose name is on the register. If the person holding the property is not the beneficial owner, *e.g.*, if he is a trustee for others, then he must account for the purchase-money to the beneficiaries.

But persons who wish to settle land will find

the luxury expensive. Two sets of deeds will be necessary, one dealing with the land itself and the other with the beneficial interest. Copyholds, dower (the widow's interest in her husband's landed property), tenancy by the courtesy (the widower's interest in his wife's landed property), are all abolished. New rules are laid down for the destination of the real (freehold houses, land, etc.) and personal property of intestates. If the intestate leave a husband or wife, he or she will take the deceased's personal chattels (furniture, etc.) absolutely, and £1,000 free of death duties. If there is no issue, the husband or wife will take the residue for life. If there is issue, one-half for life. Subject to these provisions, the property passes to the next-of-kin, *i.e.*, (1) issue, if any, failing issue, (2) parents, and failing parents, (3) brothers and sisters, failing them, (4) half-brothers and sisters, failing them, (5) grandparents, failing them, (6) uncles and aunts of the whole blood, failing them, (7) uncles and aunts of the half blood, and failing them, (8) the Crown. Other alterations may be epitomized as follows :

1. Much-needed relief is given against the forfeiture of leases for breaking covenants against assigning, under-letting, etc. 2. Power is given when the character of a neighbourhood has changed to vary covenants restricting the use of property. This is very important in view of the difficulty frequently experienced in developing property subject to out-of-date restrictions. 3. When the Act comes into force, a will made in contemplation of marriage

and so expressed will not be revoked by the marriage. 4. When two or more persons die in circumstances which make it doubtful which survived, they shall be deemed to have died in order of seniority. Now there is no presumption. 5. The purchaser of property will be entitled to the benefit of fire insurance policies pending completion of the purchase. In the absence of a special contract, he is not now so entitled, although he is liable for damage caused by fire pending completion.

The Act is the last (for the present) of a long series intended to simplify the transfer of landed property. It owes its existence mainly to the gallant efforts of Lord Birkenhead when Lord Chancellor, and will no doubt bear his name—"Birkenhead's Act." If called upon to describe its history, he might well adopt the famous saying of General Mangin when describing his great victory of 1918: "Foch planned it; Gouraud made it possible; I did it!" Lord Birkenhead might say with truth: "Sir Benjamin Cherry and other distinguished conveyancers planned it; Haldane made it possible; I passed it!" To pilot such a vast and complicated measure through Parliament was a great achievement. Let us hope that the object in view may be attained. The measure has not, however, been free from criticism. Dealing with settled land will still be a complicated business, notwithstanding the improvements effected by the Act. Few men have done more mischief than Sir Orlando Bridgeman (1606–74), an ingenious lawyer who showed the dead hand how to clutch.

He invented the system of tying up freehold property from generation to generation, which has been largely responsible for the present-day agitation against landowners. Having gone so far, it is a pity that Lord Birkenhead and his colleagues did not take their courage in their hands and cut the Gordian knot by enacting (1) that the person in whom freeholds are vested should be entitled to sell, lease, or mortgage as absolute owner and as he thinks fit in all respects; (2) that any provision to the contrary in a deed or will, past, present, or future, should be void and illegal. It is vital for the public and landowners that free dealing in freeholds should not be hampered by trusts. Comparatively few properties are to-day subject to settlements. Therefore elaborate legislation to meet such cases is misleading, as it gives the impression that a great part of England is still tied up as it was before 1882. Furthermore, nowadays most holders of settled property are anxious to be freed from their shackles, or at any rate to wear them as lightly as possible. The increased expense of the new system will probably put a stop to such settlements. Those who wish to learn more about Lord Birkenhead's Act should read Sir Arthur Underhill's "The Law of Property Act."

RING-FENCING THE WORLD

America's Great Experiment

America is engaged in a great experiment which has not attracted the attention it deserves. She is now " The Land of the Free (strictly limited) " ! By a law passed in May, 1922, immigration was restricted to 350,000 per annum, being 3 per cent. of the number of foreign-born persons in the United States according to the 1910 census. Each country is allowed a proportion of the 350,000, based on the number of its nationals resident in America at the date of the census. For example, the British quota is 77,340, being 3 per cent. of 2,578,000, the number of British-born persons in the United States in 1910 ; the German, 67,607 ; the Italian, 42,057 ; the Scandinavian, 32,244 ; and so on. When it is remembered that in some years no fewer than one and a quarter million persons went to reside in America, an idea of the importance of the change may be gathered. The law is enforced with rigour.

If the prescribed figure has been reached, the emigrant is returned whence he or she came without compunction. But there are other restrictions. Immigrants must be mentally and physically fit.

Paupers, persons of bad character, and illiterates are rigidly excluded.

The immigration law was the outcome of a long and strenuous agitation by American labour commencing in 1896, the object being " to maintain the high standard of living of the United States among wage-earners." The contention of labour was that the admission of persons accustomed to a lower standard inevitably reduced wages.

The history of the American immigration law is fully explained in a remarkable book by Miss Rosalie Jones, entitled, " The American Standard of Living " (Cornhill Publishing Company, 1923), probably not yet obtainable here. The talented author also shows that the labour clauses of the League of Nations roused strong opposition in America, as American labour resented international interference with immigration questions. An impetus was given to the passing of the law by the threatened influx of vast numbers of Russians, Poles, and others who were anxious to emigrate after the war. The national percentage quota was adopted for the same reason.

The effect of the law has been immediate. The limitation has produced a serious labour shortage and wages are therefore high. Artisans are earning as much as £2 10*s*. per day and labourers £1 per day. Many clerks are leaving their jobs and taking more lucrative employment. According to the American Postmaster-General, there were upwards of 5,000,000 unemployed in 1921, whereas in 1923 the demand for labour could not be supplied. Every year some

200,000 persons leave America, with the result that the labour pool is constantly being depleted. It is true that the wastage is recouped by the yearly excess of births over deaths, say 350,000 per annum, and by immigration within the specified limits, but at this rate the population of America will increase by only about 5,000,000 during the census period ending 1930, as compared with 15,000,000 in respect of the period ended 1920.

The magnitude and importance of the experiment are obvious. Owing to tariffs, the major part of American home trade is secured to United States manufacturers, who have been busily engaged for years part in multiplying labour-saving devices to enhance their profits. Labour has now found an implement in the shape of the immigration laws which enables the working classes to maintain high wages and thus participate in the spoil from the huge home market. American labour organization is supposed by some people to be inferior to that in this country, but the truth is that by one terrific swoop it has forged an industrial weapon the like of which the world has never seen.

The new law may have unexpected effects on Europe; 150,000 negroes are reported to have migrated from the Southern to the Northern States to avail themselves of the higher wages and demand for labour in that area. The result may well be that cotton and tobacco growers will have to protect themselves by paying higher wages, thus increasing the cost of their exports. We live in an age of

economics, and the United States immigration laws are typical of present-day thought. They are the last word expressing the desire and intention of residents in the New World to enforce a policy of which the predominating features are the comfort and economic prosperity of the man in possession. The New World, unlike the Old, will take nothing but the best in the shape of immigrants.

In the Dominions immigration regulations are somewhat similar to the American. Only physically and mentally fit persons are accepted, and there is a growing disposition to discourage immigrants, with the exception of agricultural and general labourers, who are not in possession of capital. Indeed, the Canadian regulations provide (see " Money in Pocket Law ") that an immigrant must have about £50, plus his railway fare to his destination. Penniless immigrants, however healthy, are not admitted except under special schemes.

Eugenics and economic safety are the order of the day. These modern schemes involve an interesting extension of the idea of ownership. " God made the land for the people " evidently means the chosen people who happen to be there first. But the spirit of exclusion is not limited to the New World. Nationalistic aspirations to which the Versailles Treaty gave effect have emphasized and extended fiscal boundaries. With the exception of Great Britain, every country, old and new, is intent on exploiting its resources and requirements exclusively for the benefit of its own people. And within the boundaries

of all countries, including our own, each class is bent on measures of exclusion to benefit its members.

Trade unions will not increase their memberships, except in very limited numbers. The unions say, in effect, if we admit new members we may injure existing ones who have vested interests in the particular trade. Shipowners, manufacturers, railway companies, and others are busy forming trusts and combines with the object of securing monopolies. The professions are on a different footing, being open to all who can pass the necessary examinations and pay the required fees; but lawyers, doctors, accountants, patent agents, dentists, etc., are banded together to improve their status and prevent outsiders from infringing upon their prerogatives. In short, nations and classes are busily occupied in staking out their claims either to land, commerce, or work.

Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb say in one of their clever books: "We believe that the most advanced races are to-day . . . for the supersession . . . of the motive of pecuniary self-interest by that of public service." I wish they were right, but I do not know on what their belief is founded. The facts seem to show that the group mind, at any rate, is more self-centred than ever. Mr. Snowden once said that he "could not imagine anything more fatal to the safety of the Empire or to world peace than the policy of building a wall round the British Empire," and that "the only solution of the problem (armaments) was to throw open the necessary natural resources of the world for the equal use of

all the people who required it." This is a fine conception of universal brotherhood, but here again, as we have seen, the facts are not encouraging.

For example, this sort of idealism does not exist in the United States of America. The American workman is not prepared to risk his standard of living by admitting all and sundry, and the same applies in the Dominions and elsewhere. The Japanese, whose cause Mr. Snowden was advocating, in order to preserve their standard of living, prohibit manufacturers from employing Korean and Chinese labourers. Those interested in the immigration question should read "The American Standard of Living," "Alien Visa Control of Persons proceeding to U.S.A." (U.S.A. Consulate), "Official Information for Use of Intending Settlers," and Handbooks on Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa (Oversea Settlement Office, 3 and 4, Clement's Inn, London); also Report of the Oversea Settlement Committee (H.M. Stationery Office).

IS BRITAIN A BACK NUMBER?

Two thousand years ago the Chinese Emperor Shih Huang Ti ordained that any of his subjects who should make use of antiquity to belittle modern times should be put to death with his relatives. He further enacted that all historical records should be destroyed, thus putting temptation out of the way. Luckily we have no need to fear such comparisons, but it is obvious that had King George laid down the same rule, Dean Inge and other pundits, together with their relatives, would have been decapitated long ago. My object is to inquire whether Great Britain is a back number. It may seem foolish to propound this question regarding a nation which three years ago won the greatest war in history—a nation which put six million men into the field, swept the seas, and at the same time produced vast quantities of munitions and other manufactured articles, to say nothing of financing its allies. But notwithstanding these achievements involving incalculable energy, invention, and self-sacrifice, there is a disposition in some quarters to suggest that Britain has shot her bolt, that British brains and energy are not what they were, and that Britain is on the down grade.

In the past it has always been difficult for persons living in any age to estimate the importance and extent of its achievements. This is specially difficult in a community such as ours, with its manifold interests and activities. Dean Inge expressed the opinion that Great Britain reached her zenith in the Mid-Victorian era, which would be about 1867. Therefore I propose to give a brief and necessarily imperfect account of what has been accomplished by our countrymen since that time, so that you may be able to compare modern achievements with those of the past and with those of other nations. I shall not deal with economic or commercial questions, upon which there is much to be said, but shall confine my remarks to the part taken by our country in the development of science, industry, and social comfort. I do not wish to prejudge the matter, but I think you will say, after examining the facts, that we have every reason for pride and satisfaction. It is not my purpose to belittle the doings of other nations. My only object is to show what has been done by Great Britain.

What are the most notable changes of modern life? I think they may be summed up as follows:

1. The introduction of the wireless.
2. The introduction of the aeroplane.
3. The introduction of the bicycle and motor-car.
4. The development of the telegraph and cable systems of the world.
5. The introduction of electric light and power.

6. The development of steam power by new methods.

7. The development of the internal combustion engine.

8. The development of engineering in many directions, such as shipbuilding, bridge-building, dock construction, and tunnelling.

9. Important discoveries regarding physiology.

10. The suppression of tropical diseases.

11. The development of bacteriology.

12. The development of humanizing ideas—the Factory Acts, improved workshops, improved dwellings—the desire to help the under-dog.

13. And last, but not least, amazing discoveries regarding the constitution of matter.

Now let us see what part the British have taken in connection with these remarkable developments.

First let us take the wireless. Who discovered it? Most people regard it as a foreign invention. It was nothing of the sort. It was discovered by a Scotsman. The wireless telegraph and telephone are based on the theories of Clerk-Maxwell, a genius born in Edinburgh. He worked out the properties of the electric waves, which he estimated would produce electric action at a distance, and gave their measurements. This was in 1871. Eighteen years later Hertz, a German, verified this hypothesis by experiment. He proved the possibility of sending wave-lengths across a few feet. Another Briton, Sir Oliver Lodge, perceived the possibility of sending messages many miles by increasing the wave-lengths and using

special receiving apparatus. In this way he succeeded in sending waves through the walls of the Royal Institution in Albemarle Street, London.

Marconi, the son of an Italian father and an Irish mother, came to England in 1896. He was introduced to Sir William Preece, the electrical engineer of the Post Office, by Mr. Campbell Swinton. Sir William himself had already passed messages by wireless between the Isle of Mull and the mainland of Scotland. He was much impressed by Marconi's ideas, and helped him with funds and expert assistants. Before long Marconi signalled on Salisbury Plain a distance of 30 miles, and in the year 1900 increased the distance to 6,000 miles. During recent years the wireless system has been greatly improved by the invention of the thermionic valve, which has made wireless telephony possible. The inventor is Sir John Fleming, a Lancashire man. As you know, wireless has been developed chiefly by British capital and British enterprise. There is a mistaken idea that patentees are not well supported in this country. The history of wireless alone is sufficient to disprove this.

The telephone was invented to a great extent by a Scotsman, the late Professor Graham Bell. It is true that he had emigrated to America, but he was Scottish nevertheless. When in America I met an enthusiastic Scotsman who brought me a privately printed book which he had spent many years in preparing, containing the names of the most prominent Scotsmen who had lived in America since the days

of Washington. It was a remarkable work. I said to him, "It looks to me, from the size of this book, as if every prominent American was a Scotsman." He said, "Well, you are *about* right."

While America has the honour of producing the first practical flying-machine, the whole of the working formulæ regarding stresses, strains, etc., in aeroplane construction, now in use throughout the world, were deduced and published by a committee appointed by the Government, of which the late Lord Rayleigh was chairman, and Sir Richard Glazebrook, Sir Dugald Clerk, and Mr. Lanchester prominent members. Another committee worked out similar details in connection with the internal combustion engine. At the end of the war we were producing no fewer than 1,000 aeroplanes per week, an output not equalled by any other nation.

The pneumatic tyre and internal combustion engine have been two of the most important factors in changing modern life. The internal combustion engine is the basis of the motor-car and aeroplane, while the pneumatic tyre is an essential part of both bicycle and motor-car.

The pneumatic tyre was invented by R. W. Thomson, an Edinburgh man. It was rediscovered by Dunlop, another Scot. The improvements in detail by Welch and Bartlett produced in all essentials the pneumatic tyre of to-day. The differential gear of the motor-car was first used in cotton-spinning, and was the invention of an Englishman, Holdsworth, who patented the arrangement in 1826. This gear

was used for varying the speed of rotation of the bobbin, and is still used for this purpose, but the differential gear—the same principle—was adapted by Starley, of Coventry, for motor-car purposes.

Bicycles and motor-cars mean good roads. The road out of which the modern road grew was invented by a Scotsman called Macadam about 1815. Before his time roads were constructed of flags, granite setts, or large stones. When motor traffic demanded a different sort of road, Great Britain again came to the fore, and provided what was necessary. The tarred road in all its varieties is due to British invention.

While on the subject of roads, it may be well to mention that the British have been in advance of all other nations in managing road traffic—one of the great problems of modern town life. France, America, and other countries have copied our methods, but the London policeman still stands supreme as a traffic director.

Nothing has changed the world more than the electric cable and electric telegraph. A striking demonstration of this is the fact that Liverpool cotton brokers, with special cable facilities, frequently send messages to New York and receive replies within five minutes. The cable systems of the world have been mainly established by British capital and enterprise, by the efforts of men such as the late Sir John Pender, another Scot, and his son, Sir John Denison Pender, chairman of the Eastern and Associated Telegraph Companies. In 1872 the systems of these companies covered about 14,000 nautical

miles. To-day they cover no less than 140,000 miles. In 1913 these companies transmitted 64,000,000 words. In 1918 the 64,000,000 had grown to 180,000,000, exclusive of Government traffic. All performed by British enterprise. Other important cable undertakings have had similar histories.

British brains, and in particular Scottish brains, produced the inventions which made these things possible: Lord Kelvin's siphon recorder; the duplex working system of Muirhead and Taylor; Dr. Muirhead's automatic transmitter vastly improved the cable service; while the transmitter of Judd and Fraser, Mr. Brown's drum relay, and Mr. Creed's automatic perforator, are among later inventions which have reduced difficulties and saved time—all British!

Then we come to electric light. Dating from the time of Faraday, the British have taken a leading part in developing the electrical industry. It is only necessary to mention the names of Lord Kelvin, Clerk-Maxwell, and Sir Joseph Swan, joint inventor of the incandescent light, to prove this point.

The gas industry was founded by a Scot, one Murdoch, who was assistant to James Watt. Murdoch first invented gas to light his way across the moors, and used to carry it in a bag on his back. Ever since his day Britain has been the leader in all matters relating to gas manufacture. Gas engineers like Dr. Carpenter, and Professor Boys, the inventor of the wonderful calorimeter, are maintaining the British tradition for ingenuity and efficiency.

The first dynamo was discovered by an Englishman named Wild. Needless to say, his invention is used in all parts of the world. Outside expert circles he is little known. His invention was improved by John Hopkinson, a Manchester man, who, like Lord Kelvin, combined the commercial faculty with the highest scientific attainments. He was also largely responsible for the improvement of lighthouse illumination, and introduced the system of group-flashing lights which is now exclusively used. Here again Britain has been to the forefront. Not only has she charted the seas, but she has erected or arranged for the erection of a great number of the lighthouses which guide the mariner on his way throughout the world. Other nations followed her example, but Britain was the pioneer.

In the manufacture of steel, Bessemer, Siemens, Thomas, and Gilchrist, and later Arnold and Hadfield, made epoch-making improvements. Siemens was a German, but had settled in this country, and Britain had the honour of adopting and exploiting his inventions.

Now let us take the subject of motive power. Every one knows that motive power is the basis not only of commercial prosperity, but of our happiness and comfort. It meets us at every point. During the past half-century inventions and improvements have been made of equal utility to those of that remarkable inventor, James Watt, a Glasgow man who lived a hundred years ago. It is the common idea that Watt invented the steam-engine. Great genius

though he was, he did nothing of the sort. There were steam-engines long before his time. What he did was to reduce the wastage of the power produced by the steam and thus obtain greater results from each pound of coal used to produce it. The coal consumption of Newcomen's engine, which preceded that of Watt, was about 20 lb. per horse-power per hour. Watt reduced this to from 5 lb. to 7 lb. British engineers during the past half-century have reduced this figure to from 1 lb. to 2 lb.

The invention of the steam-turbine by that remarkable man, the Hon. Sir Charles Parsons, an Irishman, a son, by the way, of the great scientist, Lord Ross, is in itself a romance. Sir Charles Parsons began his work in 1884. In 1894 he produced the engines of the *Turbinia*, giving 2,000 shaft horse-power. To-day the turbine engines of the *Mauretania* and other great Atlantic liners give no less than 75,000 horse-power, and in the Navy ships of the *Courageous* class as much as 100,000 horse-power. The aggregate horse-power of turbine plants throughout the world is now about 50,000,000. Without the turbine the enormous liners, battleships, and electric light stations would be impossible.

Sir Charles Parsons's inventions are to be found on every ocean and in every great power station throughout the world. It is interesting to note that Watt foresaw the possibility of the turbine. But he thought it impossible to construct such an appliance because no workman could be found who could make machinery sufficiently accurate to work at such speeds

without undue friction. Watt thought himself very lucky when the piston fitted the cylinder within one-eighth or one-quarter of an inch. This is an adequate answer to those who allege that the British workman of to-day is inferior to those of past times. The truth is that better, finer and more accurate work is produced than at any earlier period of our history. Professor Boys has shown us how to make quartz fibres for certain instrumental purposes which are less than one-ten-thousandth part of an inch in diameter, and whose strength is that of hard steel—namely, sixty to seventy tons per square inch. One hundred of these fibres would occupy the space of a human hair. Think of the precision and accuracy required in such an operation! And yet these fibres have been devised and made by the decadent British during the course of the last few years!

We all know that motor-cars and aeroplanes are due to the internal combustion engine, but most of us do not realize its importance as a means of producing power for other purposes. The stationary gas and oil engine have effected a small revolution, and have done much to solve agricultural and other problems. Here again, during the past fifty years, the British have taken a conspicuous part in the development of this important industry. Sir Dugald Clerk, a Scot, and other British inventors, are known throughout the world as pioneers in the design and construction of the internal combustion engine. Without petrol the motor-car and aeroplane would be seriously handicapped. Britain has taken an active share in

exploring and developing the oil-fields of the world. Vast sums of British capital are invested in such undertakings, and the story of British enterprise in this direction is one of the romances of history, with which the names of D'Arcy, the originator of the Burma Oil and Anglo-Persian, and Lord Cowdray will always be identified. Had they lived three hundred years ago, they would have been canonized as commercial saints. As they are of our time, they receive little public credit.

Before I leave the subject of motive power I must say a word concerning the abstract scientific discoveries which have rendered incalculable service to inventors in connection with the development of the modern steam-engine, the turbine, and the internal combustion engine. From the days of Roger Bacon, Britain has always shone in the domain of pure science. What is known as the science of thermodynamics, or the relation of heat and power, was discovered and defined by an Englishman and a Scotsman. Joule's celebrated "Laws of Heat," as modified and extended by Lord Kelvin, govern the construction of all machinery for the production of motive power. Before the days of Joule and Kelvin it was believed that heat was a material substance. They proved that heat and work are mutually convertible in definite and invariable proportions. This was one of the greatest scientific discoveries in history, and had a remarkable bearing upon practical work.

Now regarding engineering. Who builds the docks

and great harbours all over the world from Valparaiso to Dover? Who makes the railways? Who makes the tunnels? Who builds the bridges of the world? Mostly Britons, and chiefly Scots. Who designed and constructed the four great tunnels under the Hudson, comprising 24,000 ft., with 60 ft. of water overhead and the Atlantic behind? Lord Cowdray's firm, in which Sir Ernest Moir, a Scot, is one of the leading spirits. One of the gigantic railway stations of which New York is so proud was designed by an Englishman. The railways in the Argentine, some 22,000 miles, and in Brazil, some 31,000 kilometres, were built and financed by Great Britain. In India we have built railways extending to 40,000 miles. The face of Egypt has been changed by the construction of huge dams, reservoirs, and a vast network of canals.

These great works, planned by the British and financed by British capital, have added some two million acres to the land available for cultivation, in addition to increasing the value of that already cultivated. Canada was developed in a great measure by Scots—Lord Strathcona and Lord Mountstephen. All over the world British contractors and engineers are prominent—notable for the boldness of their engineering designs and the excellence of their work. British sanitation has made great strides during the last sixty years. British engineers first discovered the means of dealing with the sewage of thickly populated districts, and British methods and appliances have been used and copied all the world over.

Chadwick and Simon, two Englishmen, were the prophets of improved sanitary methods.

It is not only in civil engineering that Britain takes a leading part. She stands first in the manufacture of many types of machinery—cotton-spinning machinery, for example, and that used in the manufacture of paper and beet sugar. We are apt to forget that while the Germans made huge quantities of beet sugar they made it with British machinery.

The modern newspaper would have been impossible had it not been for British inventions in paper-making. High-speed paper-making machinery and the use of wood pulp revolutionized the industry, as the paper-maker was able by these means to produce the thousands of miles of newspaper required. Sufficient is used every week for the production of daily and weekly newspapers throughout the world to put a belt round the earth at least three times.

Great Britain was the first country to introduce the laboratory system for teaching engineering—a system now in use all over the world. The laboratory established by that distinguished man, Sir Alexander Kennedy, another Scot, at University College, London, was the father of all similar laboratories in other countries. In ship design and construction and marine engineering Great Britain stands easily first, and one has only to compare the vast ocean-going liners and modern battleships with the *Great Eastern*, built in 1852, to appreciate the invention, energy, and industry of those connected with shipbuilding in this country. The *Queen Elizabeth*, when firing all

her guns, each discharging eighteen tons of metal, develops 1,870,000 foot-tons of energy. She is capable of repeating this discharge once every minute, and when doing so develops by her guns an energy of 127,000 effective horse-power. If all her guns were fired simultaneously they would for the instant be developing energy at the rate of 13,132,000 horse-power. Think of the amazing skill required to design and construct such a machine. The great shipbuilding yards are comparatively modern, and men like Lord Pirrie will go down to history as having achieved remarkable things. Great Britain owns nearly half the total sea tonnage of the world, and builds, for herself and other nations, about 60 per cent. of the world's output in each year. Britain not only builds the ships: the British shipowner is the ablest and most successful in the world, whether it be in managing tramp steamers or ocean liners. Other nations have copied our methods without acknowledgment, but Britain still rules the waves.

It is a proud thought that Britons have saved more lives than any nation in history. We all know the enormous mortality due to tropical diseases. During the last quarter of a century this has been greatly reduced. Malaria and other tropical diseases have been successfully combated. Mr. Joseph Chamberlain's great claim to fame was the part he took in this campaign. But three Scottish doctors were the men who really did the work. The late Sir Patrick Manson was the pioneer. He tracked the mosquito as the cause of filariasis, and suggested

that it was also responsible for malaria. Sir Ronald Ross pursued and verified this theory. He traced the malaria microbe, which had been discovered by a Frenchman, Laveran, in the females of a certain class of mosquito. He proved that people living in a malaria area were immune if they were protected, particularly by night, from mosquito bites. He proved also that if people resident in non-malaria districts were bitten by mosquitoes which had already bitten malaria patients, they would contract malaria. He further proved that if mosquitoes were deprived of the opportunity of sucking the blood of malaria patients they were unable to infect persons whom they subsequently stung. By this fine piece of inductive reasoning the responsibility of the mosquito for carrying malaria was established. By preventive measures malaria has been reduced to a minimum in many places where formerly it was rampant. Sir David and Lady Bruce performed similar services in connection with sleeping sickness and Malta fever, by discovering the organism which produced these deadly complaints.

In the domain of physiology the most remarkable discoveries of recent years relate to the nervous system, bacteriology, and the ductless glands. Sir Charles Sherrington, an Englishman, president of the Royal Society, is the leading authority in the world on the nervous system, and his work has been recognized by showers of honours from scientific bodies in most civilized countries. He discovered that each muscle is richly furnished with sense organs which

consciously and unconsciously regulate its action, especially for attitudes and posture, and demonstrated the precision and speed with which they cut short or obliterate previous actions which would impede or interfere with the new incoming act.

Much as in the magic lantern a new slide suppresses the picture or pattern of the previous one, so that the previous picture shall not confuse the next succeeding one. Sir Charles found that even "standing," "walking," etc., are automatic actions performed with but little call upon the higher parts of the brain, which are thus left free for more complex functions. This is why we can walk, eat, and think at the same time. Thirty years ago the functions of the ductless glands, the thyroid, pituitary, adrenal, and pineal, were practically unknown. To-day it is recognized that the secretions of these glands are the basis of life. That discovery has had a great effect upon our conception of the human body. If the thyroid does not work properly, all sorts of horrible things may happen to you. On the pituitary gland depends your size and sex characteristics. If you have too much pituitary secretion, you are a giant; if too little, you are a dwarf. The adrenal gland makes disinfectants, and also supplies adrenalin to stimulate the heart when action is required. This is the gland that comes into operation when you are angry or afraid. In this field, again, Britain has led the way, chiefly owing to the work of Professor Starling and Sir William Bayliss. If all these wonderful glands were

placed in a parcel you could put it into your waistcoat pocket.

When we come to surgery Britain has a glorious record. All modern surgery dates from Lord Lister, who wrote in 1867 : " When it had been shown by the researches of Pasteur that the septic property of the atmosphere depended on the minute organisms suspended in it, it occurred to me that decomposition in the injured part might be avoided without excluding the air by applying as a dressing some material capable of destroying the life of the floating particles." It was Hunter, a Scot, who changed surgery from a handicraft to an art, and it was Simpson of Edinburgh who, by the discovery of ether and chloroform, robbed it of its horrors. Amazing surgical adventures have resulted from these discoveries. Abdominal surgery and brain surgery are two of the most brilliant and fascinating of modern surgical conquests. One of the most dramatic occurrences in surgical history was the reading in 1888 of a paper on " Surgery of the Brain and Spinal Cord," by MacEwen, of Glasgow. As Sir Berkeley Moynihan says in his brilliant review : " Cerebral surgery seemed to spring Minerva-like into the world, complete at every point." MacEwen, a Scot, and Victor Horsley, an Englishman, were without doubt the pioneers in cerebral surgery.

Our conception of food values has undergone a complete change during recent years. British workers have done much in relation to vitamines, of which we hear so much. Exactly what vitamines are has not yet been ascertained, but it has been proved that

a certain quantity is necessary for the sustenance of the human body and certain animals. A dog deprived of vitamines speedily becomes feeble and dies, and there seems to be little doubt that rickets and scurvy are largely due to an insufficiency of vitamines. The Lister Institute has rendered splendid service in making these investigations.

In the wonderful discoveries connected with bacteriology Britain has played her part. Sir Almroth Wright, an Irishman, was the originator of the system of anti-typhoid inoculation, which saved hundreds of thousands of lives in the war. In previous wars the deaths due to typhoid usually far exceeded those due to wounds. In this war, owing to Sir Almroth Wright's work, and that of other bacteriologists who co-operated with him, typhoid was reduced to a minimum. In fact, the success of preventive medicine was one of the most remarkable things in the war.

While the past fifty years cannot claim the credit of biological discoveries of the same importance and dramatic interest as those of Darwin, Sir Ray Lankester and other British workers have done much useful work in checking and building up the theory of evolution.

We are often told that Britain is backward in chemical products, and frequent reference is made to the German dye industry. It must be remembered that Sir William Perkins, an Englishman, was the pioneer in the discovery of chemical dyes. It must also be borne in mind that the inventions of Dr.

Mond, of alkali fame, and Kastner, an American, were developed in this country by British capital, and that Britain is one of the greatest producers of heavy chemicals.

To pass for a moment to farming and stock-breeding, although the finger of scorn is often pointed by ignorant persons at the British farmer, and although he is often charged with being old-fashioned, the truth is that no industry has made greater strides during the past fifty years. To-day the British farmer and stock-breeder lead the world. The Scottish farmer is the best of all, and the Scotsman is the most welcome of all agricultural settlers in new countries.

In the region of social improvement our country is entitled to the highest place. Mr. George Cadbury and Lord Leverhulme initiated the movement for brighter and better factories and dwellings for work-people. The Factory Acts, Workmen's Compensation Act, and other measures for improving industrial conditions, originated in this country. Other countries, notably America, have followed our lead, but Britain originated these ideals.

In the matter of athletics and games alone the world owes much to Great Britain. The whole movement has grown up during the last sixty years. Where would America be without golf? It is only thirty-eight years ago that Dunn and Willie Park exported the first golf-clubs to New York. To-day there are thousands of golf-courses in America, and Chicago itself has no fewer than thirteen public links. If it were not for golf imported from Scotland by

Scotsmen, half America's business men would long ago have died of dyspepsia, and the other half would either be in lunatic asylums or divorced for irritability. I sometimes think that American millionaires like Mr. Rockefeller, whose lives have been saved by golf, should subscribe a fund to discharge the British debt to America in recognition of what Scotland has done for them!

Early Victorian art is a by-word, but perhaps it appeals to Dean Inge. The general opinion is, however, that in music, painting, and architecture there has been a distinct renascence during the last half-century. I am told by competent authorities that since the days of the Stuarts we have not had such fine musical composers as have been produced during the past fifty years—Sullivan, Elgar, Ethel Smyth, Vaughan Williams, and the rest of them. Musical education throughout the country has advanced by leaps and bounds. I am told also that British painters stand second to none, and that artists like Orpen, Augustus John, Fiddes Watt and others are recognized upon the Continent as princes in their profession. Architecture has shown marked improvement as compared with the early Victorian era, although it may not compare favourably with the best examples of previous periods. Regarding that all-important matter, the philosophy of life, Voltaire remarked that loving and thinking were the only things worth living for. The modern world does not follow this precept. It is bent on action. We live in an era of telegraphs, telephones, railways,

motor-cars, fast ships, wireless, and aviation, conditions which demand, in ever-increasing degree, equanimity and self-control on the part of the individual. In this respect I claim that the British people will bear favourable comparison with any other nation.

I shall conclude by shortly describing an epoch-making discovery in which Britain has played the leading part. For two thousand years clever people have been theorizing as to the composition of matter. The Greeks, an inquisitive race, took great interest in the subject. In their deductive fashion they reasoned that you might divide and divide, but that eventually there must be a limit. They therefore assumed, and rightly, as it now appears, that all matter was compounded of minute particles, which they denominated "atoms." Little progress was made in demonstrating this theory until in 1803 John Dalton, a Manchester chemist, placed it on a scientific basis. His ideas were developed by Clerk-Maxwell, in the middle of the last century, and the theory was finally established by Sir J. J. Thomson, who is half English and half Scotch; Sir William Ramsay, a Scot; Sir William Crookes, Professor Soddy, Sir Oliver Lodge, Sir William Bragg, Mr. Bragg, and Mr. Moseley, all English; and Sir Ernest Rutherford, born in New Zealand, but no doubt of Scottish parents.

Briefly stated, they have proved by a remarkable series of experiments and mathematical calculations that all matter, all the eighty substances which we know as elements, consist of atoms which may be

described as the tiny bricks of which the universe is built up, and that these atoms themselves consist of positive and negative particles of electricity. The further discovery has been made that atoms and electrons are in a continuous state of violent motion. An atom is so small that five million atoms of helium could be placed in a line across the diameter of a full stop, and yet these great scientists whose names I have mentioned have learned how to weigh and measure them. In other words, the universe is one electrical mass bound together by inscrutable forces as yet undiscovered, and possessing energy beyond the limits of imagination, energy which, if released in small portions, would render all other forms of power unnecessary. I said " other forms of power," but that is inaccurate. As all matter consists of electrical units, it is obvious that steam, the internal combustion explosion, and electricity are all manifestations in one phase or another of the electrical unit. It remains to be seen whether man can discover the secret of releasing another and more potent form of energy. At the moment the outlook is not hopeful, but probably, if the secret is discovered, it will be unearthed by a Scotsman !

PROBLEMS OF THE FUTURE

When a boy I sometimes accompanied a relative who was surveying sites for the new London Board Schools. The things that struck me most on these trips were the miserable housing conditions in many districts, the filth and general degradation. In reply to inquiries why people lived in this way I received two different versions. Some of my informants said that slum-dwellers lived as they did because, like the dogs in the hymn, " it was their nature to." You might provide them with better houses, but they would always relapse into squalor. Others were more reassuring. They said: " Provide the houses, teach the people the advantages of order and cleanliness, and in time you will see a marked improvement." Years later in a railway train I met a Birmingham doctor who told me that a Mr. Cadbury was trying to solve the housing question by building an industrial town called Bournville. He described him as " a practical idealist."

After this I took an interest in Mr. Cadbury's plans, but my knowledge of them was fragmentary until I read the Memorial Number of the Bournville Works Magazine. Briefly stated, " the horrors of the slums, the miseries of devitalized childhood

and stunted womanhood, and the sorrows of the aged poor having entered like iron into his soul," Mr. Cadbury set to work to found an industrial garden city which to-day contains 1,077 houses. In 1879, when the scheme was started, it was a new idea. It has been widely copied, not only in this but in other countries.

Mr. Keir Hardie said in 1911 :

> What I have to say about Bournville is that if we could compel our local authorities to follow where private enterprise has led, we should speedily eradicate slumdom, and with slumdom many of the evils which follow in its train, especially the great white scourge, consumption. We should make it impossible for either long hours or low wages to be continued. Give a man and his wife and children a decent little home to live in, a bit of garden to cultivate, and opportunities for work and recreation, and he will insist upon having both the time and the means to enjoy these privileges.

This was a great tribute to a practical idealist who not only built good houses and healthy factories, but by personal contact with his workers taught and encouraged them to take advantage of their amenities. Lord Leverhulme and other great employers have done the same.

Now, it is interesting to study what led to the Cadbury scheme. I have been reading the General Report on the Sanitary Conditions of the Labouring Population of Great Britain presented to Parliament in 1842, a remarkable document written by a remarkable man—Sir Edwin Chadwick, a barrister who, in his early days, had lived with the great Bentham, a practical philosopher with all sorts of brilliant ideas. He first proposed the Suez and Panama canals. He

helped to reform the law. He established a system of philosophy and gathered round him a group of able men, including John Stuart Mill. He ran a model prison on behalf of the Government, and, to overcome the popular objection to dissection, directed that his body should be publicly dissected and lectured upon. (The lecture is to be found in Bowring's edition of Bentham's Works.)

His whole life was devoted to practical public work, and the terms of his will regarding the dissection of his body give a good idea of the man. It was made in 1769, when he was only twenty-one. It reads: "This my will and special request I make, not out of affectation of singularity, but to the intent and with the desire that mankind may reap some small benefit by my decease, having hitherto had small opportunities to contribute thereto while living."

He lived to eighty-five, and two months before his death wrote a memorandum confirming these directions, his intention being to assist the passing of the "Anatomy Act," the object of which was to provide bodies for dissection and to abolish corpse-snatching. Stimulated by this wonderful old man, Chadwick at an early age became interested in the health and condition of the people. He was appointed to inquire into the working of the Poor Laws and to examine the treatment of children in factories. In 1834 he became Secretary of the new Poor Law Commission, and at once commenced an agitation which led the House of Lords to direct a series of inquiries culminating in the Report of 1842.

In this Chadwick showed that industrial Britain was in a sad plight. There was no system of drainage; open sewers, open cesspools, dunghills, and other similar abominations were common in all towns. There was no proper water supply, the wells and springs being often contaminated by sewage. The streets were filthy. There was no provision for dealing with infectious diseases. There were no baths, washhouses, or mortuaries. Fevers and other endemic (due to permanent local causes), contagious, and infectious diseases were prevalent, and last, but not least, the housing of the working classes was a disgrace. Slums, overcrowding, and damp, dark, unhealthy dwellings abounded in every district.

In 1843 Chadwick wrote another report dealing with the Practice of Interment in towns, in which he showed the evils of burial-grounds situated in thickly populated areas, and of the national customs regarding funerals. At that time bodies were frequently kept unburied for ten days or more, and the expenditure by all classes upon funerals and mourning was excessive. These reports are painful reading, but Britain was no exception, as similar conditions prevailed in other countries. The reports created a profound sensation, and no doubt led Disraeli to write "Sybil," or, "The Tale of Two Nations" (the Rich and the Poor), one of his best works. The advertisement says:

The General Reader whose attention has not been specially drawn to the subject which these volumes aim to illustrate—the Condition of the People—might suspect that the Writer had been

tempted to some exaggeration in the scenes that he has drawn, and the impressions he has wished to convey. He thinks it therefore due to himself to state that the descriptions, generally, are written from his own observation; but while he hopes he has alleged nothing which is not true, he has found the absolute necessity of suppressing much that is genuine. For so little do we know of the state of our own country, that the air of improbability which the whole truth would inevitably throw over these pages, might deter some from their perusal.

His descriptions of industrial England are, however, obviously taken in part from the first Report. Charles Dickens was horrified, and wrote (March 6, 1843) to Dr. Southwood Smith, Chadwick's chief coadjutor, of whom more hereafter:

I am so perfectly stricken down by the Blue-book you have sent me, that I think of writing and bringing out a very cheap pamphlet called "An Appeal to the People of England on behalf of the Poor Man's Child," with my name attached, of course. I should be very glad to take counsel with you in the matter and to receive any suggestions from you in reference to it.

On March 10, 1843, he again wrote:

Don't be frightened when I tell you that reasons have presented themselves for deferring the production of that pamphlet. I am not at liberty to explain them further just now; but *rest assured* that when you know them, and see what I do, and where and how, you will certainly feel that a sledge-hammer has come down with twenty times the force—twenty thousand times the force I could exert by following out my first idea. Even so recently as when I wrote to you the other day I had not contemplated the means I shall now, please God, use. But they have been suggested to me; and I have girded myself for their seizure—as you shall see in due time.

What the "sledge-hammer" was I do not know.

The Government, however, were slow to take action, but the agitation, in which Lord Shaftesbury took a leading part, continued, and in 1848 the first Public Health Act was passed, accompanied by the Nuisances Removal and Diseases Prevention Act. They covered the whole field of sanitation. General and Local Boards of Health were established and provision made for drainage, water supply, quarantine, closing insanitary burial-grounds, street-cleaning improvements, etc. This all sounds commonplace, but in those days the Acts were revolutionary. They also provided that when the deaths in any district appeared excessive, an inquiry should be held to discover the cause. Chadwick was appointed Secretary of the General Board and Southwood Smith one of its members. The Board at once attacked their task with vigour. Denouncing all stagnation of filth, not only in public ways or in domestic cesspools, but also in the badly constructed sewers and house-drains, which were but cesspools under another name, Chadwick propounded the cardinal doctrine that all sewers and drains should be water-flushed, and it was at his instigation that earthenware pipes were introduced. He was, however, impatient of delays in carrying out his reforms and somewhat arbitrary in his dealings with Local Authorities.

The result was that he became one of the best abused men of his time, and had to resign after ten years' service, but meanwhile he had done a great work for humanity. Its fame spread all over the civilized world, and, mainly owing to his efforts and

those of Southwood Smith, Britain had the honour of being the pioneer in improved sanitary methods.

Chadwick died in 1890, at the age of ninety, and a few months before his death got the K.C.B., for which he had to wait thirty-two years! Southwood Smith was Bentham's doctor. Starting life as a dissenting minister, he had taken to medicine and had become Physician to the London Fever Hospital. He made a study of the slums and insanitary conditions, and wrote illuminating reports which formed the basis of Chadwick's investigations. Incidentally, he was grandfather of Miss Octavia Hill, one of the first women to take up social reform.

The strong point of these Benthamites was their insistence on realities. They perceived that high-sounding phrases regarding the rights of the people must be resolved into improved social conditions, and resolutely set to work to accomplish this object. The reforms which they initiated changed the face of the country. Typhus fever, the scourge of insanitary districts, has practically vanished. To-day it would be difficult to find fifty cases throughout the whole of Britain. At least so I am told by eminent doctors. And, generally speaking, the health of the people has vastly improved. Seventy years ago, at birth a male child's expectation of life was forty years, whereas for the decennial period ended 1912 it was fifty-one and a half years, while the expectation of a female child has risen from forty-two to fifty-five years. Juvenile mortality under fifteen has, in the case of males, been reduced from 327 to 195 per

thousand, and in females from 303 to 172 per thousand. The figures for the last Census are not yet available. Rickets, one of the most widely spread infantile diseases, which, according to some authorities, affects 75 per cent. of the children in the temperate zone, is gradually being brought under control.

Dr. Corry Mann, of the Medical Research Council, says that, owing to the work done in Infant Welfare Centres, it appears that in ten years' time, so far as concerns London, rickets will be relatively uncommon (see *British Medical Journal*, December 23, 1922). Much, however, still remains to be done in the matter of housing, and it is high time that we removed this national disgrace. There is, however, another side of the picture which demands careful thought. Reform must not be limited to preserving infants and increasing longevity. It is equally important that the people should be happy and comfortable.

This leads us to the vital question: What will happen if the birth-rate is maintained? In the forty years 1871 to 1911 the population of Great Britain increased about fifteen million (from 26,000,000 to 40,800,000). In the last ten (1911–1921) it increased about two million, notwithstanding that the births were about one million four hundred thousand less, no doubt partly due to the war. The population was also specially affected by war losses amounting to, say, 700,000. The emigrants amounted to about five hundred thousand, but this figure is

open to question, as it merely represents the difference between the numbers of persons entering and leaving the country. It remains to be seen whether these small islands can adequately maintain a much larger population. This is a perplexing problem which will have to be faced. Emigration can, of course, do much to alleviate the congestion. Before the war, according to the Registrar-General's figures, emigrants amounted to about two hundred and forty thousand per annum as against an annual excess of births over deaths of about three hundred and eighty-five thousand, but, as explained, the emigration figures are doubtful. Some relief may also be found in agricultural developments, but, when all is said, the problem of our rapidly advancing urban population is the vital question of the future.

It must be remembered also that increased longevity adds to the national burden by increasing the number of ineffectives for manufacturing purposes, although there are many notable exceptions. According to Professor Brownlie, Director of Statistics of the Medical Research Council, during the last decennial period the population over seventy years of age increased 20 per cent. as compared with an increase of 5 per cent. in that between twenty and fifty, with the result that there are an additional 200,000 persons over seventy ("Reconstruction in Europe," Section 6, published by the *Manchester Guardian*, August, 1922). With 1,450,000 unemployed, and, say, another 250,000 on half-time, a little undiluted Benthamism is required. The facts

will have to be faced. Our foreign trade will, no doubt, improve with more stable conditions; but will improved trade enable us to maintain a population increasing at the rate of, say, 2,500,000 every ten years after allowing for emigration at the rate of, say, 2,000,000 during the same period?

Those who wish to study the development of sanitation should read "English Sanitary Institutions" (Smith, Elder, 1897), by that great sanitary reformer, the late Sir John Simon, one of the many medical stars produced by St. Thomas's Hospital; also "Life of Dr. Southwood Smith," by his granddaughter, Mrs. Lewes (Blackwood, 1898).

LORD CURZON'S "TALES OF TRAVEL"

BADGES are sometimes useful, sometimes ornamental, and sometimes dangerous. Lord Curzon was badged early in life, and the badge proved tenacious. The scribbler who wrote:

> My name is George Nathaniel Curzon,
> I am a most superior person . . .

badged his victim for all time. The rhyme even pursued him to America, and percolated to the remotest provinces of India. Its history is interesting. It was contributed to a rhyming competition in which the competitors, including Lord Curzon, then an undergraduate, endeavoured to caricature each other. This skit alone survives. It leaked out and has been travelling ever since.

"Superior" has many inflexions of meaning. The lines were taken, and doubtless intended, in the sense in which Disraeli described the member for Stroud. "In private life there is always . . . some person . . . who is regarded as a superior person. They decide on everything. They lecture everybody . . . The right hon. member for Stroud is the 'superior person' of the House of Commons." Now, the truth is that Lord Curzon was superior in the true

sense. He had far more brains, energy, industry, knowledge, and felicitous powers of speech than most people. But it must be admitted that he possessed qualities lending colour to the popular interpretation of the rhyme—his stiff and upright carriage, due, be it said, not to a proud spirit but to a steel girdle worn owing to an injured spine; his well-turned, rounded phrases—he spoke on all occasions with the same oratorical precision as if addressing the House of Lords; his fondness for ancient monuments and beautiful buildings; his old-fashioned courtly manners. He was a charming companion, with a constant flow of witty, well-informed conversation. Indeed, owing to the variety of his knowledge and extent of his wanderings, he would have been just the person with whom to spend a week on a desert island. He might, it is true, have exhibited a restless desire to investigate and catalogue the fauna and flora, which would have been trying, but day and night would have been enlivened by his brilliant conversation. Travel was his real love. Few men had travelled so widely and done so much. In "Tales of Travel" (Hodder and Stoughton, 28*s.*), he tells us that the Gold Medal of the Geographical Society for exploration and research gave him greater pleasure than becoming a Minister of the Crown. The synopsis of his travels in the introduction gives an attractive glimpse of his romantic experiences.

I remember, almost with a start, that it is the middle-aged and sedentary politician who in the early 'nineties shot *Ovis Poli* on the Pamirs, who nearly foundered in a typhoon off the coast of Annam,

and was reported as murdered in Afghanistan. I am again the youthful rover who was stoned by furious Spaniards on the quays of Valencia; who climbed to the crater of Etna in deep snow by night to witness the glory of the sunrise over Sicily and the Straits; who saw the cone of Adam's Peak throw its shadow, also at sunrise, over the folded mist-wreaths that smoked above the steaming valleys of Ceylon; who stayed with the Amir Abdur Rahman Khan at Kabul, and with the afterwards murdered Mehtar of Chitral; who arrested the Abbot of a Korean monastery for stealing his watch and purse, and was himself arrested as a spy in Khorasan and in Wakhan; who was wrecked off the coast of Dalmatia, and explored the source of the Oxus; who wrote travel books that, *mirabile dictu*, still find readers and have appreciated in value; and who even composed an Oxford Prize Essay in the cabin of a steamer on the Nile. . . .

Each of us has his own museum of such recollections. Among mine not the least prized are these: the music of many nightingales floating across the water from the coasts of Athos; the incredible glory of Kangchenjunga as he pierces the veils of the morning at Darjiling; the crossing of a Himalayan rope-bridge, sagging in the middle, and swaying dizzily from side to side, when only a strand of twisted twigs is stretched between your feet and the ravening torrent below; the first sight of the towered walls, *minæ murorum ingentes*, of Peking; the head and shoulders of an Indian tiger emerging without a suspicion of sound from the thick jungle immediately in front of the posted sportsmen; the stupendous and terraced grandeur of Angkor Wat; the snowy spire of Teneriffe glimmering at sunrise across a hundred miles of ocean; the ethereal and ineffable beauty of the Taj.

Most of us believe that Lord Curzon was born with the proverbial silver spoon in his mouth. But this is not accurate. In his early days he had but little money, and when at Oxford eked out a slender income by journalistic work, which one of his friends tells me brought him £300 per annum, of which he was inordinately proud. His father was a country gentleman of the old-fashioned type, who considered

that after making the " Grand Tour," customary for young men of position in those days, it was his son's duty to settle down, enter Parliament and take an active part in the administration of local affairs. He had no sympathy with his *wanderlust*, and thought that the East should be left to take care of itself. Consequently his son's determination to see the world caused a certain amount of friction in the domestic circle. Lord Curzon's love for ancient buildings was intense. When Viceroy of India, he found the temples and other historic buildings neglected. He took steps to restore them, and ever since has been mainly instrumental in preserving these priceless relics of antiquity. A room, filled with Napoleonic relics, is another instance of his thoroughness and industry. It is one of the best collections of the sort, and, notwithstanding his many occupations, like the lady in the Rosary song, he loves to count his treasures " every one apart," and linger on their history and merits.

His chief defects were that he was interested in too many things and paid too much attention to small details. Politics, foreign affairs, travel, literature, art, architecture, buildings, household management, all claimed a share in his busy days. Superficial observers may fail to note one aspect of his character. Like many who are impatient regarding small things in the general conduct of life, he was the soul of patience and endurance. Notwithstanding indifferent health, he worked steadily day in and day out with tireless

activity, apparently never weary and never bored. No official read more Government papers, and probably no man in the country had such an output of memoranda, dispatches, and letters written in his own hand. At the shortest notice, and with practically no preparation, he could speak well on most subjects, and was undoubtedly the best after-dinner speaker of his time from the point of view of bright, witty oratory. I remember hearing him, as President of the London Library, move the adoption of the Annual Report. It was evident that his speech was unprepared, and yet for half an hour he spoke about books and libraries in brilliant and engaging fashion, pointing out how great libraries accumulated by individuals for their own pleasure had now passed to the democracy, so that books formerly enjoyed by the few were now at the disposal of the multitude.

Like most other great people, Lord Curzon had many phases. Never sparing himself, he was a hard taskmaster, continually enforcing the doctrine that useful work is the chief end of man. On the other hand, he was a sentimentalist with strong and lasting memories. His touching and unpremeditated little speech regarding John Oliver Hobbes, delivered some years after her death, is a good instance.

Whether we agree with his politics or not, every one must recognize him as a great and self-sacrificing public servant. Variety is the spice of life. What a horrible world it would be if we were all similar! Men like Lord Curzon, whatever their

party and pedigree, are like brilliant colours in a dark background. They may sometimes dazzle or sometimes irritate the onlooker, but they enliven and illuminate a drab world.

HOW TO SELL GOODS

How the salesman should pursue and capture his prey is not an inappropriate subject for the sporting season. The mystic art of selling goods consists in helping the customer to purchase what he wants and in persuading him to purchase what he does not want, or what he does not know he wants. Therefore, it is obvious that the sale of goods offers interesting possibilities for persons of a sporting temperament. It is not a new art. Whether the Greeks reduced it to a system, as they did most things, I do not know, but a salesman might do worse than study Aristotle's "Rhetoric," containing, as it does, all that can be said about the art of persuasion. It is only during recent years that selling methods have been elevated to the rank of a so-called science. This development is due to the vast changes in retail trade. The problem has been revolutionized by the mass production of goods due to machinery, the creation of enormous stores, the unit shop system, and the improved education and status of those engaged in this class of business. The modern idea regarding salesmanship has been enshrined in various books published here and in America. Probably similar works exist in France and Germany, the French in particular

being great storekeepers. Mr. Thomas Russell, one of the ablest authors of this type, has recently written two books, one "Retail Salesmanship" (Cassell, 1*s.* 6*d.*), and the other, "An Introduction to Sales Management (Domestic and Export)" (Duckworth, 7*s.* 6*d.*). He justly describes these subjects as being of "paramount commercial importance." The truth of this remark will be generally recognized by a nation of shopkeepers depending for its existence on successful shopkeeping.

If we are to maintain our leading position, when selling our goods we cannot afford to go about armed with bows and arrows when our competitors are equipped with modern rifles. Mr. Russell says many useful things about the organization of a sales department, but his observations are chiefly directed to the less technical, and for the general reader more interesting, subject of the psychology of the salesman and the customer. Put in a nutshell, the modern gospel of salesmanship—it is only fifty years old—is nothing more than an elaborated exposition of the education formerly given by the wholesaler or shopkeeper to his apprentices, who were taught to understand what they were selling, how to study their customers' requirements, and how to secure their confidence. See Sir Walter Scott's vivid description in "The Fortunes of Nigel" of the methods of that brilliant salesman, Jenkin Vincent.

The fatherly grocer or butcher revered by his feminine customers is the true master of the art of salesmanship. We all realize the disadvantages of

salesmen who lack interest, courtesy, or technical knowledge, or are unable to find quickly what they have in stock. The decline of the apprenticeship system has rendered new educational methods necessary. Hence the training advocated by Mr. Russell and others. Every one is not a born salesman, but most can learn the art. Mr. Russell emphasizes points which, although obvious, are often neglected by the inexperienced. The chief is the necessity for sound technical training. For example: a man who is selling gloves should know how gloves are made, what they are made of, the special uses of each type, etc., so as to be able to advise and assist the customer in making a selection. Another essential is a good vocabulary. People get tired of hearing things described by the same adjectives over and over again. A little originality and enterprise in this respect will go far. "Attractive," "pretty," "smart," "useful," "decorative," etc., can be worked to death.

In America they do these things on a grand scale. At the Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburg, for instance, there is a Research Bureau for retail trading, presided over by Mr. Charters, who has produced a somewhat elaborate treatise, "How to Sell at Retail" (Skeffingtons, 12*s.* 6*d.*), "based on a careful analysis of the technique and selling experiences of three hundred very efficient salesmen." Modern America is keen on developing salesmanship, and for that purpose courtesy. Most large concerns employ lecturers to teach these arts.

"The customer is always right," is the prevailing maxim. It is said to have been the invention of the late Marshall Field, the Chicago storekeeper. Its application is comprehensive. Nowadays all and sundry are instructed how to comport themselves. In an hotel, for instance, if a visitor orders sausages and afterwards alleges that he ordered eggs, the waiter must not argue, but blandly admit a mistake in the kitchen and bring eggs. Whether sycophancy of this sort is good salesmanship may well be questioned. No doubt Marshall Field's object was to emphasize that the customer must be permitted to be the best judge of his own wants.

Amongst Americans there is a difference of opinion whether even now "shop persons," as they call them, are as courteous as they should be, but all admit that there is a much-needed improvement.

The great storekeepers of America disseminate the idea that they are public servants and not mere traders. This propaganda has far-reaching results. The staff, feeling that they are part and parcel of a beneficent organization, imbibe unction and zeal and exude courtesy and attention. The public learn to regard the store not only as a money-making machine, but as a well-run public institution. The status of the proprietor is raised from that of a storekeeper to that of a public benefactor. And lastly, the proprietors, while keeping a sharp eye on the profit and loss account, try to live up to this high ideal by providing their customers with efficient service.

This idea is not so fantastical as it appears at

first sight, and is specially adapted to America, where make-believe is more prevalent than in this country or in France. Interesting information concerning this and other aspects of American storekeeping is contained in Mr. A. Lincoln Filene's "A Merchant's Horizon" (Riverside Press, Cambridge).

Few of us realize the extent to which our habits and mode of thought are influenced by traders' combinations, and the ideas prevailing in particular trades. Even Communist leaders are plastic clay in the hands of the Tailors' Cutters' Association, which ordains male fashions from time to time. And the Undertakers' Association is trying to rob death of some of its sting by improved and unobtrusive methods—coffins taken home after dark, artistic window display, brighter funerals, etc. Three persons die in Great Britain every two minutes, with a total of some 700,000 per annum, and yet how little we see of the preparations for burial! Let us hope that these reforms are not proving unremunerative to the trade. We know from "Oliver Twist" that the public appreciate suitable innovations on these melancholy occasions. The brilliant idea of substituting the diminutive Oliver, with his hat-band reaching to his knees, for a fully-grown mute at infantile funerals, caused indescribable admiration and emotion among all the mothers in the town, and thus largely increased the business of Mr. Sowerberry, the ingenious inventor.

Mr. Charters's book may be regarded as epitomizing much of this steadily growing system of commercial

education. The titles of a few of his chapters will best explain the scope of his disquisitions: "Failure to size up and handle customers"; "Interest and courtesy"; "Patience and good temper"; "How to handle two customers at once" (Conjuring tricks of this sort are dangerous. The salesman usually lets both customers slip.—R.); "Opening the sale"; "Defining the customer's needs by questions, or through showing goods"; "The selling talk"; "When and how to mention prices"; "Meeting objections"; "Learning to know merchandise"; "How to take care of stock"; "Locating stock quickly"; "The sizing-up process"; "Remembering names and faces" (Vitally important. "'Tis sweet to know an eye will mark our coming and look brighter when we come"—even in a store or shop.—R.).

Mr. Charters is more flamboyant than Mr. Russell, and some of his methods are unduly artificial, to say the least of them. It is doubtful whether many of the petty arts described by him and his correspondents are effective in the long run. For instance, one is not favourably impressed by the methods of an enterprising carpet salesman:

> I tell my customer that a certain rug might not give very good service (even if I know it would). Then I point out another (of perhaps the same price and quality), and tell her I could recommend that one sincerely. I don't think there's any misrepresentation in that, and customers fall for it. They think you will surely tell them the truth about everything.

Humbug of this sort does not go far. It diverts

attention from essentials and tends to form a tricky mind. But, generally speaking, Mr. Charters's ideas are unimpeachable and, above all, practical, though I think he pays undue attention to the so-called " sizing up " of the customer. More often than not, it is the customer who consciously or unconsciously " sizes up " the salesman. This Mr. Charters admits by implication :

> In a questionnaire to customers, asking them to state the considerations which led them to return to the same salesperson, it was found that the most attractive qualities are interest, courtesy, and pleasing personality. The votes show clearly that in the minds of the customers courtesy is twice as important as intelligence. Similarly, when asked what sort of actions in salespeople were particularly displeasing, they listed indifference and discourtesy three times for ignorance once. When asked what were their reasons for trading at certain stores, forty-three per cent. stated that it was interested and courteous service, while only thirty-one per cent. trade with a store because of its special values in merchandise.

Mr. Charters's plans for sizing up and classifying customers are mild, however, compared with those described in " What You Want to Know in Salesmanship," by Mr. Major Scott (Ouseley). This author explains a terrifying scheme for classifying customers into six mental groups, each being modified by temperamental optimism or pessimism. Any salesman who relies on such far-fetched methods is not likely to prove a success. An intuitive knowledge of human nature, usually the result of observation and experience, is of inestimable value, but, when all is

said, courtesy, interest in the customer, honesty, and sound technical knowledge are the chief essentials. In short, the salesman's personality is what counts.

WHEN TO STOP

A Question of Judgment

My friend, Mr. Davis, Democratic candidate for the American Presidency, has been treating the reporters to a little homily on the preparation of election addresses.

He made his text the maxim, or rather a portion of it, imparted by John Bright to a budding orator: "Think of your various subjects as so many islands, to each of which you swim gracefully in succession." That excellent paper, the *New York Times*, gently chides Mr. Davis for having omitted the most vital part of John Bright's advice: "But never, under any circumstances, leave your last island." In the interests of accuracy, I may say that I believe this piece of epigrammatic wisdom did not originate with Mr. Bright, but was communicated to him early in his career by a dissenting minister.

Whoever may have been the author, the advice not to put out to sea from your last island is sound and sacred. It is a dangerous expedient, frequently ending in an oratorical watery grave. To attempt to perorate on a peroration or to proceed without definite ideas usually ends in a verdict of suicide while

of unsound mind. More people die from indigestion than starvation, and more audiences are overwhelmed by too much than disappointed by too little.

But to pull a speaker's coat-tail, however eagerly he may have requested this kindly office beforehand, and strange though it may seem, in these days of cheap watches, such requests are not infrequent, is fraught with dangerous consequences. The critic often suffers a fate similar to that of Gil Blas, who was asked by his patron the Bishop to indicate when his Grace's preaching was not up to his usual standard. Gil Blas did as he was told, and got the sack in consequence.

Needless to say, the gift of knowing when to stop, which, of course, implies the gift of knowing when to continue, is the art of life. It is the essence of successful working, playing, eating, drinking, exercise, reproving, praising, speculation, teaching, business enterprise, and a host of other things. Most swimmers err because they fail to recognize the last island. Others who perceive that it is the last have not the strength of mind to stick to it. And some bored or adventurous spirits strike out into the unknown hoping, by good fortune, to land on another and more exciting island. It is all a question of judgment and temperament.

DEMOCRATIC PERPLEXITIES

Recent happenings in South Africa have again revived interest in General Botha; what he did; and what he stood for. He has been well described by Lord Buxton and Sir William Orpen. What better biographical fate could a statesman desire than to be handed down to posterity by two friends and admirers possessing the gift of picturesque description and viewing him from essentially different standpoints? This has been General Botha's happy fortune. Lord Buxton, Governor-General of South Africa from 1914 to 1920, has enshrined him in a book of recollections ("General Botha." John Murray, 12*s*. net), and Sir William Orpen, who writes almost as vividly as he paints, has given a striking account of him in "An Onlooker in France" (Williams and Norgate, 15*s*. net). Both estimates agree, and having known the General, I can vouch for their accuracy. A unique and fascinating personality, unlike most soldier-statesmen—Cromwell, Chatham, Wellington, Washington, Napoleon, and the rest—he was a sentimentalist. Temperament again! But temperament developed by the experiences of his life.

Hardships that would have made most men bitter only increased his natural sweetness and benevolence.

His life brings out in strong relief fundamental perplexities of democratic government. To what extent is a government justified in enforcing its own views—presumably those of the majority—upon a vocal and insistent minority? To what extent are the rights of free speech and free action to be allowed in relation to questions of vital importance to the community? If a government is determined, in the final issue, to have its own way, is it justified in permitting a dissentient minority to fulminate with the object of creating conditions which must eventually involve drastic action? When should suppression begin? Botha's policy was conciliation, and he was a sentimentalist, but when faced with rebellion he sternly suppressed it by force of arms. The only alternative was abdication, and he was no quitter.

Born in 1862, the son of a farmer, he became a prosperous farmer himself in spite of many difficulties. He married in 1886. In the 'nineties he took to politics, as a supporter of General Joubert as opposed to Kruger. But when the war came, without hesitation he joined the Boer forces, of which, at thirty-eight, he became Commander-in-Chief. Peace was signed on May 31, 1902. When Botha took leave of his staff, he said: "My days of rest are over. I shall only be able to rest when I am in my grave." He was a true prophet. In 1906, when that far-sighted act of statesmanship, the Campbell-Bannerman Constitution, was established in the Transvaal, Botha became Prime Minister. In 1910 the Union

of the four South African States—the Cape, Transvaal, Natal, and Orange Free State—was accomplished by a compromise providing that Cape Town should be the seat of the Legislature, Pretoria of the Executive, and Bloemfontein of the Judicature. Botha became Prime Minister of the Union Government, and held the position until his death in 1919.

What he and his colleague, General Smuts, did in the war is well known. They gave enthusiastic support to the British cause; they put down a rebellion; and carried on two successful campaigns against the Germans, one in East and the other in West Africa. At the Peace Conference they were two of the most prominent figures. Sir William Orpen gives a graphic account of Botha as he appeared to "Onlookers":

General Botha was big, large and great in body and brain—elephantine! Everything on an immense scale, even to his sense of humour. He had no sign of pose, like most of the "frocks" (the politicians). He never seemed to try to impress anyone. One could notice no change in his method or mode of conversation according to whom he was speaking. The great mind just went on and uttered what it thought, regardless of whom it uttered it to. In Mrs. Botha he had the ideal wife. Together they were like two schoolchildren. "Louis" and "Mother," how well they knew each other, and how they loved their family and home! They were always talking of "home" and longing to get back to it. Alas! Louis only got back there for a very short time, and now "home" will never be the same for "Mother."

What arguments they used to have—fierce arguments which always ended the same way! "Louis" would make some remark which would absolutely pulverize "Mother's" side of the question, and as she was stammering to reply, he would say very gently: "It's all right, Mother, it's all right, you've won!" And she would flash out with: "Don't you dare to say that to me, Louis!

You always say that when you get the best of the argument."

She used to complain to me how terrible the General's love for bridge was, and how she used to be kept up so late. He would laugh and say: "But, Mother, you didn't get up till nine this morning. I was walking in the Bois at half-past six."

In other language Lord Buxton says much the same thing:

His standard of conduct was based on a natural sense of honour, duty, and obligation. His integrity and honesty of purpose were patent. Obviously and transparently sincere, his dealings were above board, and there was no concealment as to his views or sentiments.

Unaffected, modest and unassuming, he combined natural simplicity with inherited shrewdness; he was at once both wise and simple, with a refreshing fund of common sense.

In manner he was dignified, simple, and natural, most courteous and considerate in his bearing; and his genial and kindly ways, his winning and encouraging smile, his hearty handshake, dissipated shyness and reserve.

Lady Buxton, in a charming little narrative of a voyage to England with General and Mrs. Botha, completes the picture:

His eyes were extraordinarily bright and full of life, and nothing escaped them. I used to watch him playing bridge—a game he loved, and which he played very well. He sat looking vast and completely absorbed, but he gave an impression of intense mental alertness and of never losing an opportunity.

An outstanding characteristic was the combination of great size and height with amazing quickness. It was interesting to watch his skill at games, especially on board ship in a confined space; no one could have been swifter or more "on the spot" if they had been half his height and size. His face was very mobile and full of expression, and his quick response to any appeal or emotion was reflected at once, whether it were annoyance or pleasure, gratification or worry—he was transparent in his betrayal of what he felt.

He was, perhaps, too sensitive, and felt things too deeply for any real enjoyment of public life. His swift and certain response

to a call on his good nature added greatly to his personal attraction. His understanding sympathy with sorrow and anxiety can never be forgotten by anyone who experienced it.

Botha much resembled a benevolent Covenanter. As Lord Buxton says, " his belief in the guiding hand of God was the bed-rock of his existence." He had an intuitive breadth of vision and grasp of fundamentals, but perhaps failed to realize the force and permanence of European animosities due to racial and nationalistic aspirations. Perhaps also he failed to appreciate that conciliation is not always a magic wand to transmute opinions. The memorandum he wrote on his Agenda paper at the signing of the Treaty of Versailles on June 28, 1919, is significant and pathetic: " God's judgments will be applied with justice to all peoples under the new sun, and we shall persevere in prayer that they may be applied by mankind in charity and peace and a Christian spirit. To-day I look back in thought to May 31, 1902 " (the date of peace between Britain and the Transvaal). I think he knew he was a dying man. Two months later he died in South Africa.

He was an interesting talker, without a trace of egotism or vanity. He made you feel you were in the presence of a great man, with a calm, simple mind, earnest convictions, a fine character, and dauntless courage; one who had inspired great policies and taken the leading part in executing them; a statesman and a man of action. I asked him once whether he was much harassed in mind in 1914. He said quietly: " No. I knew I was right. I did my

best and did not fear consequences. When the trouble started I sent for my old commanders. I told them how matters stood, what my intentions were, and asked them to nominate ten of their number to serve as my officers in the forthcoming campaign. Then I left the room so that they might confer. When I returned their spokesman said, 'We leave it to you to select the ten. The remainder will serve as privates.'" He told this in a modest way, but with a touch of simple pride in the loyalty of his people which was most affecting.

These two books bring back a remarkable day spent in visiting the French battlefields. The party included General and Mrs. Botha. We lunched in a ruined villa which had been Foch's headquarters. It was a sight to see the General struggling with his own private chicken on the top of a barrel, and I shall never forget the beaming smile with which he dispatched two tit-bits by Mrs. Botha for the benefit of Mrs. Lloyd George and myself. He was ever the soul of courtesy. Notwithstanding early experiences, Botha was devoted to Britain. When President Wilson opposed the grant of certain mandates to the Empire, Botha almost moved him to tears by a dramatic speech. He said he had been Britain's enemy, but owing to her magnanimity and sense of justice he had become a loyal and affectionate subject of the Empire. It was a brief but amazing bit of oratory, described by President Wilson as the most touching and convincing speech he had heard. It completely altered his views, and made even the

cynical old Clemenceau look surprised. A testimonial of this sort was a novelty. On another occasion, when an article had been published alleging serious differences of opinion between the British representatives, Botha asked me if nothing could be done to prevent such statements. He said: "We must present a united front. If there is any dirty washing to be done, let us do it in private. Let us show the world, at any rate, that we are all one!" He was an Imperialist and a patriot.

Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome and London

NATIONAL LIBRARY
CAN. BOOK EXC. CENTRE
BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE
CTRE. CAN. D'ECH. DU LIVRE

JUN 2 6 1980